Vol. XCVIII, No. 2 February, 1938

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE LENTEN FAST: IS IT AN INSUPPORTABLE BURDEN? 97
The Rev. L. J. TWOMEY, S.J., St. Marys, Kansas.
"TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD" 111
The Rev. PACIFICUS RAITH, O.M.Cap., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
A NEW CALENDAR BY 1939? 125
The Rev. EDWARD S. SCHWEGLER, D.D., North Collins, New York.
"PROPRIETARII." I. 132
The Right Rev. Monsignor H. T. HENRY, Litt.D., Washington, D. C.
THE FORTHCOMING REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 141
II. The Need of a Revision.
The Rev. WILLIAM L. NEWTON, D.S.Script., Cleveland, Ohio.
BLUFFING MEN OUT OF CHRISTIANITY 150
JOHN COYNE, Los Angeles, California.
PROTESTANTS AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS 158
The Rev. D. J. RANKIN, Iona, N. S., Canada.
CONFIRMATION BEFORE FIRST COMMUNION 160
The Rev. VALENTINE T. SCHAAF, O.F.M., J.C.D.,
The Catholic University of America.
"USUAL CONDITIONS" FOR GAINING A PLENARY INDULGENCE 166
EXEMPTION FROM ABSTINENCE BECAUSE OF AGE 174
RECENT THEOLOGY 180
The Rev. FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R., S.T.D., Esopus, New York.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

PUBLISHED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
FOR
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

1722 Arch Street
PHILADELPHIA
Copyright 1938, American Ecclesiastical Review
Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional
Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 43 Newgate St., London, E. C. 1, England
Ireland: Veritas Company, Ltd., 7 & 8 Lower Abbey St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 244 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, C. 1.
Entered, 2 July, 1904, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879
5 March, 1930, under Act of 28 February, 1925. Published at 113 E. Chestnut Street, Lancaster, Pa.

The

Catholic University of America

(MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES)

GRADUATE COURSES

(Including Late Afternoon Courses)

FOR PART TIME AND FULL TIME STUDENTS

(Co-educational)

COURSES IN

ARCHITECTURE
BIOLOGY
CELTIC
CHEMISTRY
CHURCH HISTORY
COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY
ECONOMICS
EDUCATION
ENGLISH
FRENCH
GEOLOGY
GERMAN
GREEK
HISTORY
ITALIAN
MATHEMATICS
MECHANICS
PHILOSOPHY
PHYSICS
POLITICS
PSYCHOLOGY
NURSING EDUCATION
RELIGION
ROMANCE LANGUAGES
SEMITIC LANGUAGES
SOCIOLOGY

Arrangements for graduate work may be made by corresponding with

DEAN ROY J. DEFERRARI
Dean of the Graduate School
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

January issue of 1937 is exhausted. Any subscriber who has an extra copy to spare would confer a favor by sending it to us.

Contents Continued

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Bluffing Men Out of Christianity 150
John Coyne, Los Angeles, California.
Protestants and the Communion of Saints 158
The Rev. D. J. Rankin, Iona, N. S., Canada.
Confirmation before First Communion 160
Lotio Vaginalis Again 164
"Usual Conditions" for Gaining a Plenary Indulgence 165
Another Crucifix with "Toties Quoties" Indulgence 169
Exemption from Abstinence because of Age 174
Authorization to Erect Stations of the Cross 175
Playing Organ during Distribution of Communion 176
Hymn at Offertory of the Mass 176
Gospel for the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost 177
Wearing Cope at Funeral Sermon 178
Interpreting Intention of Giver of Mass Stipend 178
Is Maniple Worn when Making Sunday Announcements? 179

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Theology 180
The Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D., Esopus, New York.

BOOK REVIEWS:

Brady: Rome and the Neapolitan Revolution of 1820-21 193
Plassmann: The Priest's Way to God 194
Hofmann-Buchberger: Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche 194
McCann: St. Benedict 196
Morrison-Rueve: Think and Live 197
Holzner: Paulus 198
Ketter-Molitor: Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben Erklärt 198
Burton: Sorrow Built a Bridge 199
Lunn: Spanish Rehearsal 200
Knoblaugh: Correspondent in Spain 200
Lunn: Spain and the Christian Front 200
Monica: And Then the Storm 200
BOOK NOTES .... 203 BOOKS RECEIVED 207

The Rite of Adult Baptism

This vest-pocket manual gives the complete Rite in both Latin and English (printed in red and black) just as found in the **Ritual**, with its 53 numbered sections.

The symbols and ceremonies are lucidly explained.

An invaluable brochure for **Priests** who are instructing prospective converts; as well as for the **Converts** themselves and their **Sponsors**, who will be able through it to follow the beautiful prayers of the Rite and understand the meaning of the whole ceremony.

Bound in imitation leather, attractive and durable; 100 pages; size 3¾ by 6 inches.

Price { **60 cents a copy**
$2.50 for five copies

The Dolphin Press - - - 1722 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

The most electrifying book on social justice yet published

CREATIVE REVOLUTION

J. F. T. Prince

This small package of literary dynamite is an indictment of all those who by creating or tolerating social injustice have fostered Communism. It *begins* where other volumes leave off! It is hard-hitting . . . it is fearless . . . it is just! It has the kind of stuff that brings the reader up short with the realization that he must get out and *do* things! $1.50

Now Ready – Father Doheny's

CANONICAL PROCEDURE IN MATRIMONIAL CASES

The first complete commentary in any language on the new instruction for procedure in matrimonial cases. Includes a thorough plan of court procedure briefly indicating all necessary steps in a trial, and contains practical cases of the Sacred Roman Rota in English.

and

PRACTICAL MANUAL FOR MARRIAGE CASES

This presents a summary outline of the information contained in the above book. It contains samples of all the forms to be used in the procedure and gives, in its entirety, the Latin as well as the English of the *Instruction*. It will prove very helpful in easily locating any material on marriage cases.

A MODERN GALAHAD

ALBERT S. FOLEY, S.J.

This beautiful life of St. John Berchmans is noteworthy for the incorporation of the findings of recent research, as well as many of the Saint's own writings. . $2.50

Just off the press!

Ross Hoffman's

TRADITION AND PROGRESS

$2.00

At your bookstore, or direct from

THE BRUCE PUBLISHING CO., 308 Montgomery Bldg., Milwaukee, Wis.

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

TENTH SERIES.—VOL. XI.—(XCIX).—FEBRUARY, 1938.—NO. 2.

THE LENTEN FAST: IS IT AN INSUPPORTABLE BURDEN?

FASTING in church law traces its origin to the forty days and nights which our Divine Lord spent in prayer and fasting before entering upon His public life. It was practised even in Apostolic times.[1] As early as 190 St. Irenaeus states that the practice of fasting had come down from a much earlier period, although no uniformity of observance prevailed throughout the Church.[2] St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, in the Festal Letter to his flock, in 331, makes perhaps the first recorded mention of the forty-day fast:

> The beginning of the fast of forty days is on the 5th of Phamenoth (1 March), and when, as I have said, we have first been purified and prepared by these days, we also begin the Holy Week of the Great Pasch on the 10th of Pharmuthi (5 April), in which, my beloved brethren, we should observe more prolonged prayers and fastings and watchings, that we may be enabled to anoint our lintels with precious blood, and so escape the destroyer. We cease fasting, then, on the 15th of Pharmuthi (10 April), when we hear from the Angels in the evening of the seventh day of the week, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? for He hath risen." [3]

In St. Basil (d. 379) we meet a direct reference to the Lenten fast:

---

[1] Acts 13:3; 14-22; Didaché (Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum) 7:4.

[2] Contained in a letter of St. Irenaeus to Pope St. Victor I during the Pastoral Controversy; preserved in fragment form in Eusebius's *Church History,* Bk. 5, C. 24, NN. 12-13.

[3] Quoted by Thurston in *Lent and Holy Week,* p. 5.

> Fasting indeed is profitable at all seasons, but much more at this time of Lent, when throughout all the world this ordinance of fasting is proclaimed. There is no island, there is no continent, no city or people, no distant corner of the globe, where the announcement is not listened to. Nay, armies on the march, and travellers on the road, sailors as well as merchants, all alike hear the ordinance and receive it with joy. Let no man then separate himself from the number of fasters in which every race of mankind, every period of life, every class of society is included.[4]

By the beginning of the middle ages the quadragesimal fast, as we know it, in anticipation of Easter was established throughout the greater part of the Western Church. Finally it became the practice of the universal Church.

The fast observed in the early Church was much more severe than that of later centuries. The law of fasting did not permit the use of any food earlier than sunset during Lent, and not earlier than three o'clock in the afternoon on fast days outside of Lent. Even in St. Thomas's time the hour for the taking of food was " circa horam sextam," or noon.[5] The earlier custom prohibited all liquids except water, outside the meal; later, liquids were allowed, according to the principle that they do not break the fast. It was not until the thirteenth century that the custom of taking a little food, such as fruit, bread, salad, and the like in the evening was introduced. This refection received the name of collation, apparently from the Collations of Cassian, usually read by the monks at this repast. The *frustulum,* or small quantity of food allowed in the morning, is a practice of comparatively recent origin.

Only when we consider the rigor of fasting as practised by our forefathers in the Faith, can we appreciate the indulgence that the Church has accorded Catholics in this age.

It can hardly be the mind of the Church that her fasting regulations should be applicable not to the ordinary faithful but only to the heroic few. Yet the fact is that the law of fasting in many regions is observed only by the few. This statement is attested to by leading theologians in Belgium,[6] England,[7]

---

[4] *De Jejunio,* II.

[5] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 7, ad c.

[6] Gougnard: *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.,* vol. 4, p. 207.

[7] Mahoney: " Why do Thy Disciples not fast," *The Clergy Review,* 1933, vol. 5, p. 125.

France,[8] Germany,[9] Italy,[10] and the United States.[11] Notwithstanding this fact, already existing and known in 1917, the year in which the new Code was promulgated, the Church in canon 1254 enjoined fasting on the faithful between the ages of twenty-one and fifty-nine. In drawing up the canons on fasting, then, the evident intention of the Church was that this legislation should have the force of universal law.

How is it, then, that legislation undoubtedly universal in its binding force has become very particular in its application? Some attribute the situation to theologians, who, they say, have made the conditions of observance too strict, and, on the other hand, have been too lenient in exempting whole classes and categories of persons. Others contend that the modern generation lacks either the physical stamina or the spirit of mortification necessary to observe the law. Still others, sympathetic with neither viewpoint, advance the opinion that it is the prevalent custom, directly dependent neither upon the theologians nor upon the modern generation as such, which is so stringent as to permit only the few to fast. This last group further points out that since, according to canon 1251 § 1, custom is made the determining factor regarding the quantity and quality of food to be taken outside the full meal, a more practical and benign interpretation of the law through custom is not only licit but justified by the new Code, and that such an interpretation would not only preserve the substance of the fast, but would also allow large groups of the faithful to observe the law of fasting who now find the present injunctions of custom an insupportable burden.

As defined in canon 1251, " The law of fasting ordains that only one full meal a day be taken, but does not forbid a small amount of food in the morning and evening. As regards the kind of food and the amount that may be taken at these times, the approved custom of one's locality is to be observed." Custom as referred to in this canon means legitimate usage, no matter from what source the usage derives its legitimacy, even, for example, from an indult, in which case it would not be custom in the strict prescriptive sense. Such important implications has this distinction in the matter of fasting, that it is well to cite at length a passage from Vermeersch-Creusen regarding " custom " as employed in canon 1251:

---

[8] Tanquerey: *Theol. Mor. Fund.*, 1927, n. 1113.

[9] Prümmer: *Man. Theol. Mor.*, 1928, vol. 2, n. 666.

[10] Vermeersch: *Theol. Mor.*, 1923, vol. 3, n. 886.

[11] O'Neill: *Cath. Encycl.*, vol. 5, p. 791.

> Consuetudo hic intelligi nequit proprie dicta consuetudo, legitime praescripta et moribus populi inducta: sin minus recedendum foret a temperamentis quae indultis introducta sunt, quod esset nimis durum; sed designat receptos usus—non attendendo ad eorundem causam seu occasionem—quibus aliter in aliis locis recessum est a rigore observantiae quadragesimalis, quae vespere et mane non admittebat nisi cibos esuriales. Itaque, ubi nullus fuerit mitior usus receptus de qualitate cibi, omnes et soli cibi esuriales, mane et vespere fuerint liciti.[12]

It is important to note that the law specifies neither the exact quantity nor the proportion of food that must be maintained morning and evening. It is usage which so determines. The recognition of usage by the Code is, as Dr. Browne of Maynooth observes, very significant; it shows that this law is essentially flexible,[13] and that it can be accommodated to meet new exigencies of time and place—a fact amply proved from the historical evolution of the law of fasting.

St. Thomas states clearly and succinctly the purpose of fasting when he says that fasting has been instituted by the Church to restrain the concupiscence of the flesh, to assist the mind more freely to contemplate higher things, and to satisfy for sin.[14] To this end, the Angelic Doctor continues, one full meal a day seems to suffice, so that a man can satisfy nature and at the same time check his evil inclinations by diminishing the usual number of meals; wherefore the Church has limited those who fast to one full meal a day.[15] It should be noted here that in St. Thomas's day the collation, or evening meal, was not customary; and hence whenever he speaks of fasting he makes no mention of the *frustulum* and collation. He does allow, however, the use of liquids and of " electuaria," or sweets, in small quantities apart from the full meal.[16]

---

[12] *Epit. Jur. Can.*, 1934 edition, vol. 2, n. 566.

[13] Browne: " The Ecclesiastical Fast," *The Irish Eccl. Record*, 1936, vol. 47, pp. 259-260.

[14] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 1, ad c.

[15] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 6, ad c.

[16] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 6, ad 2 et 3.

It is evident then that St. Thomas places the substance of the fast in the one full meal a day. Later theologians have adopted this standard with the further allowance set down in canon 1251 regarding the small quantity of food permitted in the morning and evening. One breaks the fast, therefore, only, when advertently or inadvertently, he partakes of a sufficient amount to constitute, or at least approximate, a second full meal.

As regards the nature of the obligation, theologians are one in holding that the precept of fasting is of its essence grave, for it is concerned with a serious matter, namely the spiritual welfare of the faithful. Pope Alexander VII condemned the proposition which stated that one who breaks the fast of the Church does not sin mortally unless he does so out of contempt or disobedience.[17] One who deliberately breaks the fast commits only one grave sin, for the fast once broken can no longer be observed on that day—" semel fractum, semper fractum ".

How is the full meal, or the " unica comestio ", of canon 1251 to be determined? St. Thomas gives us the quantitative restriction when he asserts that only he who indulges immoderately at the full meal breaks the fast, and, he adds, at the same time the law of temperance.[18] Only when fasting and abstinence coincide on the same day is a qualitative restriction enjoined. In this case the use of flesh meat is forbidden. On all other fast days fish and meat may be taken at the full meal as provided for in canon 1251; those not fasting may eat meat as often as they wish on a fast day when abstinence is not prescribed.

The time designated for the full meal is usually midday. All authors, however, following St. Thomas and St. Alphonsus, allow this time to be anticipated by an hour and even by a longer period for a just cause. Moreover, the full meal and the collation may be interchanged, as stated in canon 1251.

Authors agree that the full meal must be morally continuous; if this continuity is broken there would not be one meal but two or more. There is moral continuity if the interruption does not exceed one hour; even more time is allowed if one leaves the " cosmestio " with the implicit or explicit intention of returning. As to the duration, or time limit, common opinion holds that the one full meal should not extend beyond two hours, unless there is good reason.

---

[17] Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1123.

[18] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 6, ad 2.

It is clear then that the difficulty in the observance of fasting does not spring from the circumstances and nature of the full meal. On the contrary, the underlying reason why sweeping dispensations are granted from the law is to be found in the customs which define the " aliquid cibi " allowed in the morning and evening. It is precisely here that the law imposes upon large groups of the faithful what theologians call an " onus importabile ".

It is the *frustulum* and collation, therefore, that we must examine in our analysis of the non-observance of the fasting law. Definite limitations, both as to quantity and quality of the food taken at these refections, are imposed. Canon 1251 § 1 states that local custom is to determine what this quantity and quality are to be. As long, therefore, as custom prescribes nothing that endangers the substance of the fast, it is sanctioned by the Code. Theological teaching is, as a consequence, not a direct determinant of what is allowed at the *frustulum* and collation. It is the faithful with the consent of legitimate authority who establish custom, and if the faithful establish a usage not contrary to the substance of the fast, that usage has the force of law, at least in the locality where it prevails.

Although canon 1251 does not define the limits of the *frustulum* and collation, it sets up a precise determinant. Thus, when the quality and the quantity of the food have been approved by custom, the law of fasting becomes " materia determinata," and the individual is not free to use his own discretion in fixing the restrictions of the *frustulum* and collation. In canon 1251, it is " already existing " usage that is canonized. And hence it is important to have at hand a safe gauge or measure of already existing usage. This norm, as we shall see, is furnished in the Lenten letters or instructions of the bishops.

But where in this matter does theological teaching come into play? Theological teaching, as has been mentioned, cannot directly establish a custom, but in so far as the faithful themselves can accept such teaching and make it an operative principle, the opinion of theologians does have a decided influence indirectly in setting up this or that custom. Such happens to be the case regarding the quantity and quality of the *frustulum* and collation. From this point we are immediately led into an investigation of just what theologians have taught and are teaching in this matter.

The best approach to the discussion perhaps is by way of treating the two principal schools of thought in this connexion: the one advocating an absolute standard and the other a relative standard.

The popular conception of the absolute standard regards it as consisting of a fixed limitation of eight ounces for the collation and of coffee, tea, thin chocolate, and the like, with a small quantity of bread, not to exceed two ounces, for the *frustulum.* This concept is not altogether accurate, as can be seen from a glance at the history of the subject. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries one fourth of the full meal was accepted as the quantity permitted at the collation. This was held by Lacroix [19] and others; they cited custom as the sanction. In the eighteenth century, however, a tendency arose to fix a more definite standard than the rather vague quarter of a meal. Theological opinion then defined eight ounces as the equivalent of one quarter of a full meal, and custom made this opinion its own. It is at this point, namely about the middle of the eighteenth century, that the great moralist St. Alphonsus Liguori enters the discussion. Although he admits one quarter or one fifth of the full meal as a workable standard, yet because this standard " potest esse nimis indulgens . . . vel saltem est valde obscura scrupulisque obnoxia," he favors the absolute standard of eight ounces as a safer norm.[20] St. Alphonsus does not formally acknowledge the *frustulum;* however, he does allow " ex rationabili causa " one ounce of chocolate with one half ounce of sugar mixed with sufficient water to fill an ordinary cup. To this may be added a small quantity of food " ne potus noceat ". Following St. Thomas,[21] he permits the use of " electuaria," which include candy, preserves and jams, as not breaking the fast, provided they are taken " non principaliter ad nutrimentum, sed ad digestionem ciborum." [22]

The teaching of St. Alphonsus in this matter is not so rigid as it may appear at first sight. For, as Dr. Browne points out,[23] in the first place the unit measure with which St. Alphonsus was dealing was the Roman ounce, and eight of these approximate nine of our own. Secondly, he allows more than eight ounces to the individual needing it; an addition of two ounces was granted in such a case without question. Thirdly, " St. Alphonsus allowed this quantity of food in the warm and sunny climate of Naples," [24] and such quantity as he prescribed, while perhaps a sufficiency in warmer regions, would not be adequate in colder climes. Sporer, a German moralist, more than two centuries ago gave point to this when he wrote: " Let the Italians and Spaniards send to the Germans, in the fasting season, their warm sky, their food and rich wines, their fruits and preserves, and we will fast with them." [25] Fourthly, in agreement again with St. Thomas,[26] St. Alphonsus allows the use of coffee, tea, wine and beer " ratione meri potus," and hence the principle that mere liquids do not break the fast. Milk, however, he held to be " cibus liquidus," and beyond the limits of " merus potus ".[27] Practically all moralists hold in common with St. Alphonsus that whole milk is food.

---

[19] Lacroix: *Theol. Mor.,* vol. 2, lib. iii, pars 2, c. 3, n. 1259.

[20] *Theol. Mor.,* lib. iii, n. 1025.

[21] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 6, ad 3.

[22] *Op. cit.,* n. 1019.

[23] *Loc. cit.,* p. 262.

Of the more recent authors, Merkelbach [28] and Prümer [29] adopt the absolute standard of quantity, but place no qualitative restriction. Aertnys-Damen accept the absolute standard but allow an interchange of the *frustulum* and collation.[30] Arregui, also, champions the absolute standard,[31] as do Genicot,[32] Lehmkuhl,[33] Coronata,[34] Davis,[35] and others.

It must be borne in mind throughout this discussion that moralists in Europe, when speaking of the fasting law, lay but slight emphasis on the *frustulum*. As a yearly routine for the average European, breakfast practically consists of nothing but bread and coffee. Hence when these moralists discuss the question they concern themselves chiefly with the quantity and quality allowed at the collation. Pioneers in this country brought with them the European customs. But in the course

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

[25] *De Praec. Dec.*, app. ad 3 praec., n. 2.

[26] 2, 2, q. 147, art. 6, ad 2.

[27] *Op. cit.*, nn. 1019 et 1021.

[28] *Summa*, vol. 2, nn. 948 sqq.

[29] *Op. cit.*, n. 655.

[30] *Theol. mor.*, 1919, vol. 1, p. 398.

[31] *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, 1934, n. 447.

[32] *Theol. Mor.*, vol. 1, n. 437.

[33] *Theol. Mor.*, 1914, vol. 1, n. 1462.

[34] *De Locis et Tempor. Sacris*, 1922, n. 302 (d).

[35] *Mor. and Past. Theol.*, 1936, vol. 2, p. 400.

of time conditions, climatic and otherwise, in the United States effected a change whereby much more is now taken by the majority of Americans at breakfast than by Europeans. Thus the sudden change to a two-ounce ration presents an added difficulty to Americans, who, besides curtailing the amount taken at supper or lunch, must also reduce their morning repast to practically that amount of food taken by Europeans at breakfast throughout the year.

So decided is the effect of this sudden change upon the physical constitution of even robust Americans that the burden imposed by this interpretation of the law can be borne during the entire season of Lent only by the very few. If then the law of the Lenten fast has practically fallen into desuetude in many European countries where the difficulty is concerned chiefly with the amount allowed at the collation, it is little wonder that this situation should prevail to an even greater degree in America.

Yet it is interesting to note that the Lenten pastorals in this country have for years enjoined the absolute standard. It must be observed, however, that in some of the 1937 pastorals the absolute standard is less rigidly insisted upon than heretofore. To cite a few examples: the pastoral for the diocese of Indianapolis employs the term " the fourth part of the dinner," not mentioning the eight-ounce standard as the measure of the collation. Moreover, it allows the collation to be taken in the morning. The Lenten regulations for the diocese of Rochester allow even wider freedom: " a light meal, from which, however, meat is excluded, may be taken either as a luncheon or as a supper ". For the diocese of Buffalo the pastoral uses the following phrases: " a warm drink and a little food in the morning . . . and a supper is not to exceed in quantity the fourth part of a full meal ". The pastorals of the archdiocese of New Orleans, and of the dioceses of Omaha and Galveston speak of the collation as a " light " meal, without stating its equivalent in ounces.

The chief reasons advanced by the defenders of the absolute standard are two: first, with St. Alphonsus they say that the standard of one-fourth the full meal can be too indulgent, and because of its indefiniteness it lays the way open to scruples. Secondly, they assert that the absolute standard is simpler and easier to follow, for it gives the priest a convenient formula with which to answer the faithful who inquire about the quantity that may be taken on a fast day outside the full meal. The obvious disadvantage has already been suggested, namely that because of its practical severity it renders the law of fasting particular rather than universal as intended by the Church.

Although the absolute standard of St. Alphonsus was quite readily accepted in southern countries, its adoption in northern countries was much slower, and as a matter of fact it never met with enthusiastic approval.[36] As early as 1829 Dens, who enjoyed great prestige as a moralist in England in the early nineteenth century, wrote from Mechlin: "Some have established a certain quantity for all, but, in my opinion, not reasonably, for what is scanty for a German would be too much for an Italian." [37] He further states that even in his day religious in Belgium were allowed a half loaf of bread and a pint of beer at the collation. In the same year, 1829, Bailly, a French theologian, rejected the absolute standard.[38]

But it was not until 1850 that Cardinal Gousset, Archbishop of Rheims, even though an enthusiastic patron of the theology of St. Alphonsus, discarded the absolute standard. He lays down the general principle that persons bound to fast may take as much nourishment at the collation as is necessary to allow them to properly fulfil their tasks.[39] Still more explicitly in 1893 does Koenigs, an American Redemptorist, abandon the absolute standard. He declares that no altogether fixed rule can be determined, since some require more food to sustain them in their duties and others less.[40] These opinions assuredly break through the trammels of Alphonsian tradition relative to the *frustulum* and collation, and pave the way for what many modern theologians [41] of the first rank hold to be the solution of the fasting problem.

These authorities mention the eight-ounce collation, but only as a minimum. With this as a point of departure they proceed immediately to enunciate the following general principles: first, the measure of eight ounces may be increased for a just cause; secondly, the amount of food permitted at the collation is dependent upon various factors, among which can be enumerated age, sex, physical strength, temperament, digestive power, occupation, environment, climate, and duration of fast. Of these, duration of fast deserves special attention, for much greater reserve of physical strength is needed to fast on six continuous days each week for six weeks than to fast, for instance, on the three ember days which recur but four times a year.

---

[36] Browne, *loc. cit.*, p. 263.

[37] *Theologia*, vol. 4, p. 344.

[38] *Theologia*, vol. 2, p. 295.

[39] *Théologie Morale*, 1850, vol. 1, p. 113.

[40] *Theol. Mor. S. Alphonsi*, 1893, n. 563.

[41] By the term "modern theologians" is here meant those who have written since 1900.

Among the more notable adherents of the relative standard are: Sabetti-Barrett,[42] Noldin-Schmitt,[43] Gury-Ballerini-Palmieri,[44] Tanquerey,[45] Bucceroni,[46] Wouters,[47] Vermeersch,[48] Antonelli,[49] Gougnard,[50] Browne,[51] and others. Hence, many theologians favor a more benign interpretation of the fasting laws. Let us now examine more carefully the nature of their teaching.

In the first place, they contend that the relative standard is in strict accord with canon 1251, for this norm does not infringe upon the substance of the fast, one full meal a day, and hence cannot be said to violate the law. Canon Gougnard, of the University of Louvain, expressed this opinion clearly when, in 1927, he wrote that as the law of fasting should be so interpreted that at least the greater part of the faithful can observe it, so it should be allowed to the individual in the morning and evening to take what is needed for him to perform his duties. In other words, he adds, " that quantity of food at the *frustulum* and collation is permitted which is necessary and sufficient for fasting to be tolerable in practice." He further states that so long as only four ounces in the morning and twelve in the evening are taken, the fast is reasonably preserved. He makes a larger concession when he says that even beyond these measures it is not improbable to think that the substance of the fast is maintaned as long as the combined quantity of the *frustulum* and collation does not constitute a second full meal.[52] Following the same line of thought, Blaton, professor of the Seminary of Ghent, expresses fear that unless there is some mitigation of the prevailing absolute standard the law of fasting will fall into desuetude. Consequently he permits at the *frustulum* and collation from one-third to one-half the ordinary amount of food taken in the morning and evening of a non-fast day, if, he adds, this expedient is necessary.[53] Vermeersch, also, urges that the law of fasting be observed in a more human way than heretofore, that is, by allowing to each one at the collation what is necessary to enable him to do his work and fast. Vermeersch however, is among the few of this school who will not permit the interchange of the *frustulum* and collation.[54]

---

[42] *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, 1931, n. 333.

[43] *Theol. Mor.*, 1936, vol. 2, n. 682.

[44] *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, 1907, vol. 1, 497.

[45] *Op. cit.*, n. 1101.

[46] *Instit. Theol. Mor.*, 1915, vol 2, n. 1593.

[47] *Manuale Theol. Mor.*, 1933, vol. 1, p. 730.

[48] *Op. cit.*, n. 873.

[49] *Medicina Past.*, 1920, vol. 2, n. 880.

[50] *Loc. cit.*, p. 207.

[51] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 255-276.

Even more liberal concessions than the foregoing are granted by some exponents of the relative standard. This group maintains that, since thirty-two ounces are generally held to constitute a full meal, the quantity between sixteen and twenty ounces falls notably short of a full meal and hence does not jeopardize the substance of the fast. With this as their premise they conclude that if a person can properly perform his duties with between sixteen and twenty ounces for the *frustulum* and collation combined, he can observe the law and consequently must do so. Moreover, since canon 1251 determines no proportion between the *frustulum* and collation, any proportion, even an equal one, can be followed, provided only that the total quantity of both falls notably short of a second full meal, or, in other words, that the quantity totals twenty ounces or less. And therefore, if one, for example, could without notable inconvenience take eight ounces for the *frustulum* and ten or twelve ounces for the collation, he would be observing the fast and would be obliged by the law.

St. Alphonsus allowed double the usual quantity at the collation on Christmas Eve.[55] This means that about eighteen ounces in our weight are permissible at the " jejunium gaudiosum," as the Christmas Eve collation is called. Thus eighteen ounces for the collation and two ounces for the *frustulum* on Christmas Eve are permitted even by St. Alphonsus. Hence according to him between sixteen and twenty ounces taken over and above the full meal do not violate the substance of the fast on the vigil of Christmas. If then, as this group argues, the quantity between sixteen and twenty ounces does not violate the substance of the fast on Christmas Eve, it cannot be said to do so on any other fast day.

---

[52] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 207-211.

[53] *Collationes Gandav.*, 1933, pp. 16-25; for a further discussion of this point cf. *Legislacion Eclesiastica sobre el Ayuno y la Abstinencia*, by Dr. A. Parra Herrera, O.C.D., Cath. Univ. of A., 1935, p. 103.

[54] *Periodica de Re Mor. Can. Liturg.*, 1933, pp. 60-68.

[55] *Op. cit.*, n. 1025.

Nor, say the proponents of this opinion, can the objection constantly voiced against the absolute standard that fasting is injurious to health be leveled at this system. With the quantities allowed by those who advocate a less rigorous interpretation of the law, it should be quite possible for any normally healthy adult to fast and be much the better physically and spiritually for the experience. They cite the continued warnings of doctors against the dangers and prevalence of over-eating to allay the fears of the individual who says that by fasting he will "lower his infection resistance". Rutland-Rattler,[56] Vermeersch,[57] and numerous other authorities assert that this interpretation of the fasting law involves no danger of health to the normal person.

The advocates of the relative standard make no restrictions as to the quality of food allowed at the *frustulum* and collation except those which the customs of different regions impose. In all countries "cibi esuriales," that is, fish, vegetables, cereals, fruits, macaroni, bread, preserves and sweets are allowed, and also such liquids as wine, beer, tea, coffee, and chocolate; and in most countries eggs, and "lacticinia," that is, milk, butter, and cheese, are included by custom. Those who restrict the *frustulum* to a liquid and a little food permit this variety only at the collation. Those who say no exact proportion need be maintained between the *frustulum* and the collation allow a variety at both meals.

An anonymous writer of an article entitled "Loi du Jeune" [58] makes the following observation on the fasting problem:

> The Church wishes the faithful to observe the law of fasting. But many of the faithful are unable to fast except by taking a larger

---

[56] *Pastoral Medicine*, p. 104.

[57] *Periodica, loc. cit.*, p. 67.

[58] *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1921, pp. 593-602.

amount outside the full meal than the two and eight ounces so far allowed. Therefore, the desire of the Church is that the law of fasting be more leniently interpreted.

Dr. Mahoney has this apt comment:

> Most of us, I imagine, feel a certain reproach in reciting the Lenten Preface and Collects with their constant reference to the fast, which it is assumed all the faithful are observing. It is the universal disregard, almost contempt, of the law which is so lamentable at present, and when this disregard is on the part of otherwise excellent Catholics, we are bound to conclude either that the law is an intolerable anachronism or that the faithful have interpreted too strictly its provisions.[59]

It cannot be doubted that, were the relative standard accepted in practice, a much larger percentage of the faithful could observe the Lenten fast. They would thus be enabled to enter more fully into the penitential spirit of the Lenten season and to have the consolation of knowing that they are observing a serious precept of the Church. "It is a true privilege to lead in some sort the life of the Church; . . . to those who are able to carry out her fasts, take part in her ceremonies and recite her liturgy, there is given a share of her spirit, and a practical insight into the mysteries of our faith. . . ."[60] Participation in the fast engenders a deeper appreciation of the liturgy of this holy season, which inculcates with recurring insistence, in the prayers of the Mass and the Divine Office, the lesson that the penitential spirit is a salutary means to greater sanctification.

L. J. Twomey, S.J.

St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas.

---

[59] *Loc. cit.*, p. 137.

[60] Thurston, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

"TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD."

ALL THE CREEDS which Holy Church at various times has given to the faithful, contain the doctrine of the second coming of Jesus Christ and of His Judgment of mankind. In the Old as well as in the New Testament this event was foretold many times, in order to console the faithful servants of God and to warn the wicked. " He commanded us," says St. Peter to the household of Cornelius, " to preach to the people and to testify that it is he who was appointed by God to be judge of the living and of the dead." [1]

It is matter of faith that at the end of time all mankind will be judged, and it would seem to have been sufficient to say in the Creed: " to judge all men," because this includes both the living and the dead. There must be in this wording of the seventh article of the Creed some definite purpose. Current theological literature is quite silent about it and one finds next to no information as to what may be the reason for classifying those to be judged and how we are to understand the phrase, " the living and the dead ". We should be able, however, to render an account of it to an inquisitive convert or when we preach on judgment to an attentive congregation, which we all too seldom do, because the subject of judgment is no more popular than the subject of hell. People, they say, should not be frightened in our enlightened age.

The following pages offer an explanation of the meaning of this phrase. The reader is welcome to contribute toward clarifying it. A controversy, however, is not intended.

I.

Since the General Judgment is to follow the resurrection of the dead, there will be in consequence no one dead, but all will be living. It is therefore quite perplexing when we say, " From thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead," since, as we have just stated, following the resurrection all will be living.

There are those who understand by " the living " the souls of men; " the dead " refers to the bodies. Souls are immortal. Bodies will be dead until the day of resurrection. It is easy to see how worthless this explanation is, for the parts of persons will not be separately judged, and the Creed speaks of persons risen from the dead.

---

[1] Acts 10:42.

Others there are who take " the living " to mean the just, and " the dead " to mean sinners. This explanation is no better. When the Church gives us definitions of faith, she uses the words in their literal meaning, so that the faithful may not be led into error or into any misunderstanding.

A much better solution of the difficulty is to understand by the term " the living " those who now live, and by the term " the dead " those who now live no more. It may very well be that the Apostles worded this seventh article of the Creed purposely so, in order to oppose the pagan idea of many of their times who held that after death we shall lose our individual existence, dissolve like fog before the rising sun.

The early Christians are said to have believed that the second coming of the Lord was close at hand; some of them would be living and some would be dead. This opinion must have prevailed among the Thessalonians, since St. Paul in his second Epistle to them warns them not to be terrified as if the day of the Lord were at hand. There must first come an apostacy and after that the man of sin is to be revealed, the son of perdition. Would it really be correct to agree with these early Christians in their fear (which, if it existed, St. Paul stamped as wrong), that the coming of the Lord was close at hand even while some of them would be living and some dead? It is obvious that this cannot be the reason for the phrasing, " the living and the dead ".

There is in Holy Scripture a solid foundation and a very good reason why the Apostles in the Creed use the wording: " the living and the dead ". We read: " for if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again; even so them who have slept through Jesus, will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you in the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them who have slept. For the Lord Himself shall come down from heaven with commandment, and with the voice of an archangel, and with the trumpet of God: and the dead who are in Christ, shall rise first. Then we who are alive, who are left, shall be taken up together with them in the clouds to meet Christ, into the air, and so shall we be always with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort ye one another with these words."[2]

At the time of our Lord's coming and second presence upon earth, there will be, therefore, Christians who are alive, who remain unto the time of the "parousia" of the Lord. They will not meet the Lord up in the air before those who died. These will at the same time meet Him in the air, never again to be separated from His presence. We have here, I think, a clear statement of the reason why we say in the Creed, "the living and the dead". From this text it is also evident that St. Paul spoke not of the wicked but only of the just, whether living or dead. He says nothing of the death of those who remain unto the coming of Christ.

This silence may have great dogmatic value. St. Robert Bellarmine writes in his Catechism, which was approved by the Holy See: "If on the last day many shall be living, and many of them young people or children, all these, notwithstanding, will die in a moment and immediately rise, so that they also pay their tribute to death." In other words, death and resurrection allow of no exception, even for this class of living who shall be glorified and meet Christ without going through the decay and corruption of death. Here is the great controversy on which among both the Latin and Greek theologians, Fathers and Doctors of the Church, there is so divided and opposite an opinion. Many of these Greek and Latin Fathers hold that the just, who live at the time of the second coming of Christ, shall not die, but shall immediately be glorified. These follow the Greek reading of the text: "Behold I tell you a mystery: We shall not all die, but shall all be changed."[3]

The Greek text affirms: The just shall not all die, but they shall all be glorified. Death will in their case be made to suffer this exception. Whilst the Latin or Vulgate text reads: "Behold I tell you a mystery: We shall all indeed rise again, but we shall not all be changed," the Latin text says: Death and resurrection are universal, suffer no exception, and glorification is not for all. Of course not, since the reprobate shall not be glorified. The Latin reading does not fit into the context, for the Apostle here speaks only of the resurrection of the just; whereas the Greek text is well borne out by textual criticism. It may never be entirely clear how this difference between the Greek and the Vulgate texts originated. Most probably a copyist changed the text to bring it into harmony with the passage of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned."[4] Original sin entails death, and since original sin is universal, so death must be universal. This is sound logic. But God in justice may apply this law to everybody; He, the lawgiver, may also suspend it, if He so please. Consequently He may make this exception, that some may be glorified without passing through the gateway of death.[5]

---

[2] I Thess. 4:13-17.

[3] I Cor. 15:51 *πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.* Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur. Mark the difference of these texts!

If the reader is interested and would like to know who they are that support by their authority the Greek opinion, he may find them arrayed in the works of Suarez and Estius. Among the Greek we find: Origen A. D. 195-254, *Contra Celsum*; St. Epiphanius, 310-403; *Contra Hereses*; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 315-386, in his *Catecheses*; St. Gregory of Nyssa, 331-396, On the creation of man; St. John Chrysostom, 344-407, in his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul; Theodoret, 393-450, Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul; Oecumenius in the tenth, and Theophilact in the eleventh century. Among the Latins we find: Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Carnis*; St. Victorinus of Pettau, Commentary on the Apocalypse; St. Jerome, in many of his works. Among the more modern we find: Natalis Alexander, Cajetanus, Erasmus of Rotterdam, the theologians of Louvain, A. Delathere, Joseph Corlui, August Bisping, and others.

According to the opinion of these Greek and Latin Fathers, it is safe to say that by "the living" all the just living at that time may be understood, and shall be privileged in that exceptional manner by Christ.

II.

The Gospels and the Epistles often speak of the second coming of the Lord. Unquestionably, it will be the most magnificent event in the history of mankind when the Son of God shall appear, the King of kings and the Lord of lords, to judge the living and the dead. In ancient times when a monarch visited a province, it was called a " parousia ". This term is used in the original Greek to designate the coming of the Lord for the judgment. Other names for this event are: " Last Day,"[6] " Day of Christ,"[7] " Day of Visitation,"[8] " Day of Judgment,"[9] " Days of the Son of Man ".[10]

---

[4] Rom. 5:12.

[5] Rudolph Cornely, S.J., *Commentarius in Epist. ad Rom.*, p. 279.

" The Pharisees asked our Lord: When will the kingdom of God come? He said to them: It will not come with observation. Nobody can say it is here or there. No, behold it is already among you."[11] To His disciples He spoke of His kingdom at the end of the world when He said: " The days will come when you shall desire to see or to live at least one of the days of the Son of Man, but it shall not be given to you to live a single one. They shall say to you: Behold He is here, and behold He is there! Do not believe them, much less associate yourselves to these false prophets. For on His day, the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven shall be like unto the lightning, just so sudden, just so manifest. At that time the conduct of men shall be as it was in the days of Noah, when he entered the Ark, and the flood destroyed sinful men. It shall be as it was in the days of Lot, who went out of Sodom at the command of God, and after his departure it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed all in those ill-fated cities. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man shall be revealed."[12]

J. Knabenbauer, S. J. in Luc. 17: 22 (p. 490) says that the day which the Apostles would desire is one of the future, not one of the past. The majority of exegetes hold this view of this text. The opposite explanation is quite weak.

The duration of the Lord's presence on earth the second time, is a matter of mere conjecture. The names given in Holy Scripture to this coming of Christ do not warrant a conclusion as to its duration. The popular belief is that it will be one day, a day either of twelve or of twenty-four hours.

---

[6] Jo. 6:39-40; 11:24.

[7] Phillip. 1:8-11; 2:16.

[8] 1 Pet. 2:12.

[9] 1 Jo. 4:17.

[10] Lk. 17:22-26.

[11] Lk. 17:20-21.

[12] Lk. 17:30.

The phrases, " one day of the Son of Man," " in the days of the Son of Man," suggest a period of longer duration than the popular belief holds. It is certainly true that the expressions, " in the days of Noah, in the days of Lot, of Abraham, of David," are Hebrewisms: still the plural of *jom* was used by the Jews to designate the period of time in which these men lived.[13]

From this it seems to appear that the words, " in the days of the Son of Man," may very well mean a certain protracted period of time. For if we compare it with the expression, " in the days of Noah ", and the like, we feel very much like believing in a duration of the parousia, longer than that of an ordinary day. Add to this the probable duration of the events which are to take place during the time of the parousia: the defeat of the Anti-Christ and the conversion of many of his followers, who when they shall see that they have been duped, will be converted, and because they still are wayfarers, will be able to accept the mercy which the Lord shall show unto them.

St. John, who like all prophets abounds in allegories, describes the victory of Christ over the Anti-Christ under the picture of a great supper of the birds that fly through the heavens, feeding on the corpses of kings and tribesmen, of mighty men and horsemen, of freemen and bondsmen, of little and of great, in a word, of all those who make up the following of the Anti-Christ.[14] The Jews also at that time will desert the Anti-Christ, in order to turn to their own and only Messiah, after they shall have understood that the Anti-Christ was an arch-imposter. The Lord will receive His penitent people unto grace, " after the times of the nations ".[15] St. Paul tells us of it in the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. It is clear that events of such magnitude do not develop in a single day.

III.

The Lord shall also judge the dead. " The hour cometh, wherein all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that have done good things shall come forth unto the resurrection of life; but they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgment." [16] "At His coming all men have to rise with their bodies and will give an account of their own deeds." [17]

---

[13] Wilhelm Gesenius, *Handwoerterbuch*, Zehnte Auflage, Leipzig, 1886, pp. 330-331.

[14] Apoc. 19:17-21.

[15] Lk. 21:24.

[16] John 3:28-29.

Does this mean that before this event there can be no resurrection of the dead? In the Gospel of St. Matthew we read: "And the graves were opened and many bodies of the saints that had slept, arose and coming out of the tombs after His Resurrection, came into the Holy City and appeared to many." [18] This miracle is recorded with other miraculous events at the death of the Saviour: but it does not follow that these resurrections and apparitions took place on Good Friday. The sacred text excludes such a conclusion by stating that they came out of the tombs and appeared to many after His Resurrection. "They appeared." This indicates that they rose with their bodies glorified and that they no longer were subject to the laws of matter, space and motion.

St. Augustine and others, quoted by J. Knabenbauer, S.J., in *Commentarius in Evangelium sec. Mattheum*, think that these died again, but many more, with St. Thomas Aquinas, hold "Surrexerunt tamquam intraturi in coelum." [19] This is the more probable view to take.[20] These apparitions were a powerful testimony for the truth of the Lord's Resurrection. The saints were not raised from the dead for their own sakes, but in order to bear witness to the Resurrection of Christ, and thus to lay the foundation of the faith of the New Testament.[21]

The Didaché or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, a work well known to ancient Christian writers, which was, it seems, a manual of catechetical instruction in the early Church, lost since the twelfth century and rediscovered by Bryennius at Constantinople in 1875, tells in the last chapter of hard times preceding the parousia. "For in those days false prophets and corrupters shall be multiplied and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall change to hate. For, as lawlessness increases, they shall hate one another and persecute and betray one another, and then shall appear the deceiver of the world as Son of God and shall do signs and wonders, and the earth shall be given over into his hands, and he shall commit iniquities, such as have never been since the world began. Then shall the creation of mankind come into the fiery trial, and many shall be scandalized and shall be lost, but they who endure in their faith shall be saved by the curse itself.[22] And then shall appear the signs of the truth. First the sign of an opening in the heavens. Then the sign of the sound of the trumpet. And the third sign, the resurrection of the dead. But not of all the dead,[23] but as it was said: "The Lord shall come and all His saints with Him." [24] "Then the world shall see the Lord in the clouds of the heaven."

---

[17] Symb. "Quicumque."

[18] St. Matt. 27:52-53.

[19] 1 ad Cor. Coll. 1 Lect. 5.

[20] John Maldonat, S.J., *Comment. in Evangel. sec. Matth.*

[21] St. Thomas, Summa, III, Quest. 77, Art. 1.

The most remarkable thing about this quotation is that not all are said to rise when these signs shall be made manifest and the Lord shall appear in the clouds of heaven; for it runs counter to the belief that all men shall rise, good and bad, at the same time. However, if, as we have see above, some did rise, before those who are still in their graves at the second advent of the Lord, the word "all" would apply only to those who are still dead. We have no texts of the Bible to prove conclusively that all men must rise at one and the same time. "The hour cometh, wherein all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God. And they that have done good things shall come forth unto resurrection of life; but they that have done evil unto the resurrection of the judgment." [25] Nothing can be concluded from this text against 1 Cor. 15: 51. It cannot be said that those who do not die, are as yet in the graves. Nor, furthermore, can it be deduced that all must rise at the same moment, since the term "hour" has, as we see in the following text, a longer duration than our hour of sixty minutes. Our Lord says: "Amen, Amen, I say unto you the hour cometh and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that shall hear shall live." [26] This hour was at the time of our Lord's first coming and lasts unto the second. At this time the spiritually dead hear the voice of the Son of God. They believe and rise to spiritual life by justification. "Little children, it is the last hour."[27] This has been a very long hour. It has already lasted 1900 years.

---

[22] This passage is quite obscure. It may mean that the persecution raised against the faithful in the hands of Divine Providence shall be the very means of their salvation.

[23] *οὐ πάντων δὲ.*

[24] Zachary 14:5.

[25] Jo. 5:18-39.

[26] Jo. 5:25.

The texts from which a general resurrection has been deduced by the theologians prove that only, but not that the resurrection of all shall take place at one and the same time.

St. John, for instance, speaks of a resurrection of the martyrs and confessors during the time of the Anti-Christ.[28] "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years were finished." At the end of the same chapter, however, he describes the resurrction of all the dead and the general judgment.[29]

There is nothing in the Bible—not a verse nor a chapter—about which so much has been written as about chapter 20: 4-5 of the Apocalypse. There are shelves of books written about this one chapter. The clean have interpreted it in a clean, the sensual in a sensual manner.

Cerinth taught that during the millennium men would enjoy sensual pleasures without restraint. Jewish Christians, whom St. Jerome calls "Nostri Judaizantes" and ridicules them on every occasion, did not go quite so far as Cerinth, but their interpretation also was rejected by the Church as too materialistic and worldly.

There are many churchmen, saints and martyrs, who have taught and believed in a first resurrection and reign with Christ.

This reign would begin with the defeat of the Anti-Christ and last a thousand years. Then the martyrs and confessors spoken of in the Didaché would rise from the dead, and with Christ would rule in a state of glorification. This kingdom would rule all nations. The Church would then be in her most glorious state, and of Jesus Christ it could be then most truly said that He would rule on earth. There is nothing in this interpretation against faith or morals. If God so wishes it, we could not be thankful enough. Satan still deceives the nations, and the power of hell rules them. Masonry is, as we all know, the invisible supergovernment of nations.

[27] I Jo. 2:13.

[28] Apoc. 20:4-5.

[29] Apoc. 20:11-12.

St. Augustine was first a Chiliast.[30] He, however, relinquished this doctrine and proposed another, worthy of his genius. He tells us that the first resurrection is the justification of the sinner; the reign of Christ and of His saints is not on earth but in heaven. In his marvellous work, *De Civitate Dei*, he evolves this doctrine. It can be found in Book 20, the 6th and the following chapters. St. Augustine has had the greatest influence on theology, and we need not be surprised if *uno animo* the theologians follow him also in this matter.

On the other hand, we find St. Jerome who, although no Chiliast, did not condemn the teaching. "Although we do not follow this teaching," he writes, " we can not condemn it, because many churchmen and martyrs have taught it; so every one may follow his own conviction, and let everything be reserved to the judgment of the Lord." [31] The same saint says in another commentary: " There are those who await in the future, when the Gentiles shall all enter the Church, and Israel shall be saved, whatever we have set down as partly fulfilled or to be completely fulfilled between the first coming of the Saviour and the end of the world. Their opinion is not to be rejected, provided it be understood that these things shall be spiritually understood and not according to the flesh." [32]

We must admit with St. Augustine that justification is a spiritual resurrection of the sinner. From the beginning of the world, this sort of resurrection has been going on and will go on to the very end of the world. Man sins, is justified again, falls still again, and so on through the course of his life. There is no such stability or perseverance in grace among us mortals that it can be said of us: " Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection. In these the second death hath no power." [33] St. Augustine therefore and his followers cannot admit a millennium on earth, where people fall again and again into sin. They restrict it to heaven, where the elect are no longer in danger of falling. The most ancient defenders of the doctrine of Chiliasm maintained that they who will be adjudged worthy of the first resurrection and glorification will no longer be subject to the danger of falling, any more than the elect in heaven.

---

[30] " Hoc et nos opinati fuimus aliquando." *De Civitate Dei,* Bk. 20, Chap. 7.

[31] " Quae licet non sequamur, tamen damnare non possumus, quia multi ecclesiasticorum virorum et martyres ista dixerunt, ut unusquisque in suo sensu abundet et Domini cuncta judicio reserventur." In Jeremiam. lib. IV. 19-20.

[32] " Sunt qui haec omnia quae nos post primum Salvatoris adventum usque ad consummationem mundi, et ex parte completa et penitus complenda memoravimus, futuro tempore praestolentur, quando subintrante plenitudine Gentium salvandus est Israel. Rom. chap. 11. Quorum nequaquam sententia reprobanda est dummodo spiritualiter haec complenda et non carnaliter noverimus." In Isaiam. Chap. 60.

[33] Apoc. 20:6.

There is no convincing argument or evidence that St. Augustine and his followers are justified in interpreting, " They lived again and ruled with Christ a thousand years," as the resurrection of the soul and not of the body.[34] The Greek word ἔζησαν in Apoc. 2: 8 and Matt. 9: 18 is without doubt used in the sense of corporal resurrection. " Haec dicit primus et novissimus, qui fuit mortuus et vixit." In like manner of those who laid down their life in testimony for Jesus and for the word of God it is said: " and they lived and reigned with Christ. The rest of the dead, however, did not live until the thousand years were over."

Eusebius blames St. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, for originating Chiliasm.[35] He calls him in this passage a man of very limited comprehension, and still in the 37th chapter of the same book he called him a man of learning and skilled in all manner of learning and well acquainted with the Scriptures.

Eusebius tells the story of two grandsons of Judas, called the brother of the Lord. They were brought to Domitian, no less afraid of Christ's knigdom than was Herod. He asked many questions of them: whether they were of the race of David; how much property they had; how much money they possessed; and finally, as to Christ and His kingdom, what its nature was, when and where it was to appear; they replied, that it was not a temporal or an earthly kingdom, but heavenly and angelic, and that it would appear at the end of time when, coming in glory, Christ would judge the living and the dead and everyone would be rewarded according to his works.[36]

St. Papias was not the simpleton Eusebius makes him out to be. St. Jerome has this to say about him: "A false rumor brought to you that I translated the writings of Josephus, Papias, and Polycarp. I have neither time nor ability to express in another language such great things with grace."[37] At all events, they who embraced Chiliasm in those days in the Catholic Church were not few, nor were they all of mediocre minds. St. Justin is witness to this in his dialogue with Triphon (no. 80). Whilst, on the other hand, they who did not hold this doctrine, did not look upon those who did as unorthodox. But it is done now, although Holy Church has never taken a stand either for or against it.

---

[34] *και ἔζησαν καῖ ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ Χριστόν τὰ χίλια ἔτη.*

[35] *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. III, Cap. 40.

[36] *Hist. Eccl.*, Bk. III, Cap. 20.

In more recent times the celebrated John Maldonat, S.J., interpreted:[38] " Thy kingdom come " in the following manner: " The true meaning seems to me to be one which Theophilact and Ruperus suggest. The kingdom of God is that in which, when He has put all enemies under His feet, He will reign universally and as St. Paul says, 'be all in all'."[39] For although He now reigns everywhere, He does not reign peacefully and without enemies or war, and since many, like rebels, resist Him, He is not said to reign. But when all His enemies have been subdued, His friends liberated, and the enemies condemned, He shall be said to reign fully. This is deduced from the passage of St. Paul, cited above, which makes it quite plain that we do not here ask for our own kingdom, but for God's. For the first three petitions, as I have said, pertain to God, the others to ourselves. The meaning therefore is, not that God may reign in our hearts, nor that we may reign with the Blessed (for this would apply most especially to ourselves), but that God may reign absolutely and without an enemy. For we say, " Thy Kingdom come," like unto sons craving a peaceful kingdom and for the victory of the King, our Father, over all His enemies. We pray not that we, but that He, may reign. We wish the Kingdom of God to come as they wish it who are spoken of in II Tim. 4: 8 and in Titus 2: 18, and the souls of the Blessed in Apoc. 5: 10. " Thou hast made us kings and priests to our God, and we shall reign on earth."[40]

To sum up. We have looked at several explanations of the phrase " the living and the dead." We find sound sense in it, if we say, God will judge all who now live and all who have already passed through death to the other life.

---

[37] *Epist. ad Lucinum.*

[38] Matt. 6:10.

[39] I Cor. 15:28.

[40] John Maldonat, S.J., in *Evang. Sec. Matth.*, cap. 6:10.

Some texts of Holy Scripture tell us that at the time of the parousia mankind will not be extinct, and insinuate that they who then live and are God's just servants will be glorified without being made to go through the gateway of death. This opinion, which was held by many eminent and holy men and Doctors of the Greek and Latin Church, is the foundation for understanding why they are a separate class of those to be judged. They live in an eminent sense.

The parousia will be a very sudden event, like the flood that deluged the earth and like the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha, and it is not improbable that its duration will not be a day of twenty-four hours. If God so will it, there will be time for a reign of Christ and the saints who suffered death by the Beast for the testimony of Christ and the word of God. " There is nothing to prevent God from raising some to life before the end of the world as has been done for the Blessed Virgin, and the saints who arose after the death of Christ and ascended with Him into heaven." [41]

We have no authentic declaration of Holy Church how the text of Apocalypse 20: 4-6 is to be understood. Men who read the signs of the times believe that we are on the threshold of a new epoch of the battle between Christ and Satan. Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich is one of them. Militant and organized atheism proclaims that the very thought of God must be destroyed, and that religion, the opium for the proletariat, must go with it. In the States of North and South America, of Europe, Africa, Asia and the South Sea Islands they are working to accomplish this satanic task. The nations are like a raging sea from which the Apocalyptic Seer saw a beast ascend, which we know from Danielic phraseology means a world power, brutal and godless. History so far records only three of them: the Asiatic of Nabuchodonosor, the Greek of Alexander the Great, the Roman, the next—what? Russian or what? Communist or Fascist? We do not know, but come it will, and Christ the King of Kings will lead His armies to conquer and destroy the Beast.[42] The mystery of iniquity has its time to work and will have reached it highest degree at that time.[43]

---

[41] P. J. Berthier, *Compendium Theologiae Dogm. et Moral.*, edit. IV, 1898, p. 361, No. 1801.

[42] Apoc. 19:11-21.

[43] II Thess. 2:7.

May we not expect that the mystery of grace will also have a time, when Jesus Christ will reign with the glorified and the risen martyrs and confessors of the persecution by the Beast, as St. John saw it in a vision?[44] This is the view that many saints and martyrs took of this text. Of course, God will judge these as well as those who rise on the day of general resurrection.

We need not be more Catholic than the Catholic Church in matters of faith and morals. If the words of the Apocalypse should be literally fulfilled, it will not be a kingdom for the libertines, the servants of their belly, or the politicians and the greedy. It will be the kingdom of Christ and the faithful, when the world turns back to Him *en masse*.

Among the several opinions found in this article, the one truth stands sure and certain: all who are dead shall rise before judgment. The rest is more or less probable speculation worth what the reasons advanced are worth; but they all contribute to a better understanding of the phrase, " to judge the living and the dead ".

FR. PACIFICUS RAITH, O.M.Cap.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

---

[44] Apoc. 20: 4-6.

A NEW CALENDAR BY 1939?

THE perennial subject of calendar reform continues to pop up right along; and it is to be feared that the great majority even of intelligent and educated people do not quite understand what it is all about.

At the present time in particular there is much discussion about the possibility of introducing a revised calendar in 1939.

Why 1939?

Because that year begins with a Sunday; and the only plan for reform that has met with anything like universal approbation also begins with a Sunday. If 1939 does not bring us a revised calendar, we shall have to wait until 1950 before we again have a year beginning with Sunday.

The anxiety to start off on a Sunday is of course due to the fact that no one would wish to drop or lose one or more days by introducing a new calendar, as would happen, for example, if the Gregorian year of introduction began on Thursday. Calendar reform is sufficiently controversial as it is, without any added difficulties.

Mention has just been made of the only plan that has met with anything like universal approval. This is the so-called " World Calendar ". It consists of twelve months counting a total of 364 days. Every three months constitute a quarter quite identical with the other quarters, each of which has the same number of days, 91 (31, 30, 30), and the same recurrence of relative dates and weekday names. The World Calendar, as printed on next page, will make this abundantly clear.

With our present calendar, each year begins a day (two days in leap years) later than the previous year. The meddlesome extra day is the one left over after 365 is divided by 7, the number of days in the week. If the year consisted of 364 days instead of 365, the number of days would be exactly divisible by 7, each year would begin with the same day of the week, and a uniform calendar for each year would result.

Modern calendar reform does the unprecedented by sequestering the troublesome day (two days in leap year), making it a holiday, and taking it out of the usual succession of weekdays entirely. In this way only 364 Sundays and weekdays are counted, and the desired uniformity is produced.

From another standpoint, the plan is equivalent to taking a week in the year and ending it with two Sundays instead of one; or, as some insist, it is introducing one or two 8-day weeks into the year.

The World Calendar

Every Year the Same

JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31	..	..	..	..

APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31	..	..	..	..

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31	..	..	..	..

OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31	..	..	..	..

FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	..	..

MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	..	..

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	..	..

NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	..	..

MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	..	..	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

JUNE

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	..	..	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	..	..	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
..	..	..	..	..	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

YEAR-END DAY, December Y, follows December 30th every year
LEAP-YEAR DAY, June L, follows June 30th in leap years

When the World Calendar first come into prominence, it met with much opposition at the hands of another plan for reform. This was the 13-month scheme, sometimes also known as the Eastman plan, from the fact that George Eastman enthusiastically supported it. In this proposal, as in the World Calendar, one or two days are sequestered; for, there being thirteen months of 28 days each, or a total of 364, the extra day would otherwise still remain.

The sequestered day has received many names, as " blank day ", *dies non.* Calendar reformers prefer " supplementary day ". The other terms are misleading. The extra day or days in the reformed calendars are, after all, real days of 24 hours each. They simply have names of their own and are placed outside the ordinary calculations of the weeks.

Nowadays the thirteen-month plan is rarely mentioned in calendar reform circles and in the periodical press. Yet it is a tribute to the effectiveness of the consistent publicity orginally supporting this plan that three out of four persons who are asked about a reformed calendar will at once make some vague reference to thirteen months.

The World Calendar as above outlined has received its most powerful and consistent support from the World Calendar Association of New York. The president of this organization is a talented and energetic lady, Miss Elizabeth Achelis. She has succeeded in rallying under the banner of the World Calendar some of the most influential personalities not only of this country but of the whole world. Renowned statesmen, writers, business men, clergymen, lawyers, and a host of others have subscribed to the plan under her leadership.

The World Calendar Association has allied itself with similar groups in the principal countries of the world. Every year since 1931 it has published the *Journal of Calendar Reform*, which is sent out to all members and associates of the organization, and to all large libraries and educational institutions in the country. It is a dignified, learned review, and has helped to place the subject of calendar reform on a very high intellectual plane.

The list of contributors to the *Journal* reads almost like a publisher's dream. It is profoundly significant to find all the persons of national and international reputation who have thought enough of the World Calendar not merely to approve of it, but to write about it, or some aspect of it, *in extenso.* Just to mention a few names: S. Parkes Cadman, H. Parker Willis, Dom Fernand Cabrol, Rear Admiral F. B. Upham, Mahatma Gandhi, Professor N. C. Abott, Professor Bristow Adams, Professor C. C. Wylie, George Gordon Battle, Henry W. Bearce, Lord Desborough, D. R. Fotheringham, Ernest McCullogh, Rear Admiral W. A. Moffett, Julian Morgenstern, Erich Przybyllok, Archbishop D. Germanos, Capt. J. F. Hellweg, P. W. Wilson, Robert Hunt Lyman, Dr. I. G. Reyes, Professor Arthur Kennelly, Charles Francis Potter, James Henry Breasted, Abbé Chauve-Bertrand, Bishop Manning and many others.

Besides issuing this constant and dignified publication, the World Calendar Association has gathered together an astounding number of endorsements from all kinds of organizations, and has been the spearhead of international action on the subject.

One outstanding result of these various activities has been to make journals of public opinion twelve-month conscious. Editorial and other writers hardly mention the revolutionary thirteen-month scheme any longer. This is going to result eventually in making calendar reform and the World Calendar synonymous, even in the stubborn and slow-moving popular mind.

Concerning the advantages of a reformed calendar the present writer has already written amply,[1] and it would make this article too lengthy to recapitulate them. The present writer has also treated very exhaustively the attitude of the Vatican on calendar reform.[2] To review this briefly, the Apostolic Nuncio at Berne, His Excellency Luigi Maglione, Archbishop of Caesarea, stated for the Vatican that, though there were no dogmatic difficulties about the proposal to stabilize the Easter date, an attempt to carry out the proposal would necessitate "the abandonment of deeply rooted traditions," and that the Holy See "would not be prepared to consider the question except on the advice of an ecumenical council". Since that time (1924) the Vatican Secretariate of State has sent out to inquirers a lengthy exposition of its stand, in which a number of historical considerations against changing the present mode of dating Easter are given, and the original statement of Msgr. Maglione is reaffirmed.

Thus, a number of contrary "indications" notwithstanding, it seems certain that the Vatican, down to the present moment, looks with disfavor upon the proposal to reform the calendar. The latest proof of this is to be found in the Official Report of the Proceedings of the League of Nations Council at Geneva, 1937,[3] where we read: ". . . As is clear from the information conveyed to the Committee by several of its members, the Holy See, after having previously stated that it could not consider any change in the date of the movable feasts, has taken up an even more definite attitude during the present year in that it has approached certain governments, stressing more particularly (1) that the stabilization of movable feasts could not be separated from calendar reform, but such stabilization should be conditioned on the meeting of an ecumenical council; (2) that, as regards the reform of the Gregorian calendar, the introduction of blank days would result in breaking the continuity of the weeks and be incompatible with venerable and long-established traditions."

---

[1] "Some Aspects of a Fixed Calendar," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, January, 1935; "Do We Need a New Calendar?" *Columbia*, May, 1932; "Priests and Calendar Reform," *The Sign*, February, 1934; "Calendar Reform and the Liturgy," *Orate Fratres*, 8 September, 1934. These articles are summarized in a brochure, "Catholics and Calendar Reform," which anyone sufficiently interested may have by writing the author and inclosing ten cents in stamps.

[2] "The Vatican and a Fixed Easter," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, April, 1934; "The Vatican and Calendar Reform, *ibid.*, May, 1934.

[3] *League of Nations Documents*, C. 380 and 385, 1937. Cf. *Journal of Calendar Reform*, VII, 3, p. 129.

It would be interesting to have for publication just what the Vatican did say to " certain governments " on these occasions. It is to be doubted, for example, whether the Holy See stated expressly that " the stabilization of movable feasts could not be separated from calendar reform ". What it probably did say was that stabilizing Easter, which is a religious holiday, and introducing the supplementary day, which would have an effect on the traditionally sacred institution of the seven-day week, are both matters of a primarily religious nature, and so would have to be settled by religious authority. There is no intrinsic and necessary connexion between stabilizing Easter and stabilizing the calendar. Easter could be placed on a definite Sunday, and so " stabilized," without introducing the World Calendar at all; and, on the other hand, Easter could be placed, as at present, on the Sunday following the full moon after the vernal equinox, even if the permanent World Calendar were adopted.

One must draw the conclusion from all this that the Vatican in the past year has " campaigned " against any change in the calendar. But it also seems definitely clear that the Vatican finds no dogmatic difficulty either in the stabilizing of the Easter date or in the use of the supplementary day to stabilize the whole calendar. The latter point is extremely significant. Up to now there has been a great deal of diffidence about accepting the " blank day " idea on religious grounds.

The stand of the Holy See on the whole question of calendar reform to date is very understandable. The calendar is deeply rooted in the most venerable of traditions, and the Vatican naturally feels that no changes should be made in it unless there is an insistent and well-nigh universal demand for such changes. It also evidently feels that, the matter of Easter having been settled by an ecumenical council, any change in this element of the calendar should be settled through similar channels. Therefore the task before those interested in calendar reform, if they wish ever to gain the approval of the Holy See, is to arouse a steadily increasing volume of public opinion, whilst at the same time treating all religious angles and issues of the movement with the utmost carefulness and sympathy.

In this latter detail the World Calendar Association has been eminently successful. It has not only eliminated all anti-religious bias from its activities, but it has done much to break down the old idea that calendar reform has an essentially anti-religious motive. It has enlisted many clergymen in its ranks, and it has been particularly anxious to gain the sympathy and support of priests. Accordingly, it has published in complete or condensed form a number of articles and books written by priests in favor of the reform. One of its most successful moves along these lines was to enlist the active support of the renowned Benedictine Abbot Fernand Cabrol, recently deceased.

The occasion of the above mentioned communications by the Vatican to different governments was a draft convention for calendar reform submitted to the League of Nations Council by the representative of Chili, and sent to all the members of the League. The convention outlined the World Calendar and said nothing of the thirteen-month plan: a further indication that the former is now supreme in the field. Thirty-seven states did not answer the communication from the League. Thirty-two governments responded with the following results:

10 accept the proposal, at least in principle;
5 are definitely opposed;
4 offer no remarks;
7 cannot define their attitude at present;
4 think the reform premature.

The League Council concluded that "it is not expedient for the time being to contemplate convening a conference to carry out a reform which in present circumstances would seem to have no chance of being accepted, and that, under such conditions, it is unnecessary, until further natice, to retain the question on the agenda."

It would seem in place, therefore, to draw the following conclusions:

1. There will not be a revision of the calendar by 1939.
2. In the last few years the atmosphere has been permanently cleared, with the result that " calendar reform " now means only one thing: the World Calendar with twelve months, four equal quarters, and one or two supplementary days.
3. Neither the proposal to stabilize Easter nor the use of the supplementary day to stabilize the calendar in general meets with any dogmatic difficulties.
4. Easter can be placed on a more permanent date without changing the calendar, and the calendar can be made permanent without eliminating the present method of calculating Easter.
5. The League of Nations does not consider the matter closed, but is merely setting it aside " until further notice ".
6. The Holy See would be open to conviction if there were a sufficiently insistent demand for calendar reform.
7. It is permissible for Catholics to discuss the matter pro and con, provided always they insist on the necessary religious implications of the subject and upon the sole competence of the Holy See to pass the final decision.
8. Those interested in calendar reform must produce a much more effective and universal public opinion, before they can hope for any definite results.

And so, apparently for some time to come, we shall have to continue the time-honored practice of rattling off

" Thirty days hath September,
April, June and November . . . "

EDWARD S. SCHWEGLER.

North Collins, New York.

"PROPRIETARII."

"Compediti sunt omnes proprietarii et sui ipsius amatores . . .".
—*De Imitatione Christi,* III. xxxii. I.

ONE does not need to be a worthy bibliomaniac, or even a modest collector of editions of the *Imitation*, to become aware of certain curiously varied details exhibited in the editing of that Golden Book. It is of common knowledge that the *Imitation* bristles with difficulties of interpretation because of its "Latinitas tam turbida et peregrina", its reflection of the ascetical and canonical status of fifteenth-century devotional life, and its more restricted mirroring of the ideals and customs newly embodied in the institute of the Brethren of the Common Life.

Its Latinity comprises Dutch idioms bodily and literally transferred to Latin phraseology, Italian words adorned with Latin terminations, and corrupt medieval forms and spellings. This last-mentioned category of difficulties does not exist in our modern editions of the Latin text. But of course the Dutch idioms and Italian words still remain to puzzle a reader of the Latin text. The word *proprietarii* will perhaps serve to illustrate the canonical and ascetical status of religious life at the time when the *Imitation* was composed. And *devoti* will call attention to the Brethren of the Common Life, because of the peculiar meaning given to these two words in their literature. In brief, the Latin text presents, even to scholarly readers, many obstacles to a correct interpretation.

In view of all this, it is interesting to note the little help afforded by editions of the Latin text towards a desirable intelligibility of its meaning in many places. Let us glance at various editions. And, in order to make our unlaborious investigation of some interest to us, let us particularize it, render it concrete (as it were), by pursuing the trail of one illustration of the difficulties referred to above—an illustration which we readily find in the single word, *proprietarii.*

At first sight, *proprietarii* seems to be a sufficiently simple Latin word. We should probably render it by its similar English word, "proprietors", and let it go at that. A little reflection, however—and the context would perhaps force us into a reflective mood—might lead us to hesitate as to its real meaning. At any rate, let us suppose a young levite in the seminary reading his *Imitation* in the Latin text for the first time and thus coming upon the word in the Third Book. He will find it nowhere else in the *Imitation*—for it occurs only once in the whole lovely treatise. He has probably never met it before in his reading, for it is post-classical. What does it mean?

Small as may be the stock of books a seminarian will claim as his own, it will doubtless include (besides his formal textbooks) three volumes: the New Testament, the Little Office B. V. M., and the *Imitation*. And these will probably be in Latin. One publisher has ingeniously — (but there may be others)—met the economic limitations of the ordinary seminarian by issuing these three books in one pudgy volume. The double economy of space and price exemplified in such a volume will not lead its possessor to expect informing prefaces, notes, or commentaries. He will perhaps be unpleasantly affected by the great fineness of the print. But, considering the dimensions and the price—*Que voulez-vous?* Accordingly, if he come upon a difficulty of interpretation, he must look elsewhere for its solution or elucidation.

If the possessor of such an obese volume—a veritable Wouter van Twiller amongst books—is patient, he will console himself with the hope of being one day a more prosperous *proprietarius*. As a priest, he will place on his shelves commentaries galore on the New Testament, the Little Office, and the Imitation. With respect to the *Imitation*, however, he may hope to content himself finally with various editions of the Latin text and with variously translated editions in his vernacular tongue. From these sources he may hope to draw both refreshment and illumination—so that the *Imitation* will become for him still more lovely in its well-edited linguistic forms which now have made it more intelligible to him.

I will suppose a thoughtful (or inquisitive, nay unquiet, if you will) and therefore an easily perplexed seminarian, who balks at the word *proprietarii* in his aforesaid obese little volume. What did Thomas à Kempis wish us to understand by the declaration that " all " proprietors are bound in fetters (" compediti sunt omnes proprietarii ") ? The seminarian is himself a proprietor of the very book he is reading. To be sure, he is not a highly prosperous proprietor, as this world's goods are valued. Still, he hopes to become a larger proprietor as the years roll by, and to own several editions of the Golden Book. "And, indeed ", he reflects, " I am officially encouraged to add volume to volume, even as the ambition of the landed proprietor urges him to add acre to acre. I am urged to become not merely a lover, but an owner, of books. I am told that a love for books ought to be considered as one of the most potent of all natural safeguards of priestly virtue, and that a priest's library reflects his soul even as a mirror reflects his features. Perhaps, however, the author of the *Imitation* did not mean this kind of proprietorship, but rather that the love of proprietorship binds a person in fetters—just as St. Paul did not (although often misquoted thus) say that money is the root of all evil, but that the desire or love of it is such a root. Proprietorship is permitted to me, if only I do not become too much attached to my ownership. My means will never permit me to be much of a bibliophile; nor my many exacting duties, to become a bibliomaniac."

At this point in his reflections, our good seminarian may recall that one of his fellows is the happy proprietor of a Latin edition which is not bound in with other books and which therefore may be expected to pay some little attention to the perplexities of a reader. Doubtless its editor, having more elbow-room, will place a footnote telling the reader what is commonly understood by the word " *proprietarii* ".

One such edition is of fairly recent issue. Its extensive Preface gives some account of the life of its author, an estimate of the extraordinary value and popularity of the book, excellent suggestions of the methods best adapted for a fruitful perusal of the work, and some desirable information about the great labors of the editor which resulted in the present correct Latin text (based on the famous autograph of 1441 and on other three manuscripts placed at the editor's use). All this promises well, and our seminarian turns hopefully to the thiry-second chapter of the Third Book. He will find there, however, no note or comment on *proprietarii*. *Stat difficultas.* With lessened confidence, he turns to find an Appendix of enlightening notes. His hope is again disappointed. Apparently the meaning of the puzzling word is so obvious to an adult mind, that the editor seems afraid to appear condescending to his readers. They neither demand nor desire a note. Mayhap they would look upon such a note as a bit of superserviceableness.

Clearly, what our seminarian needs is a dictionary rather than a commentary. For Gilbert's playful remark that " things are seldom what they seem " is peculiarly applicable to certain Latin words. Out of a large number of instances, *res* and *ratio* come to his mind forthwith. *Proprietarii* has doubtless " tropical " significations, or perhaps strange colloquial uses, or possibly peculiar technical intimations. Shall we, then, turn to our old and faithful friend of our classical studies?

When we enter the field of Latin dictionaries, it is true that we do not confront a phalanx of volumes. Their name is not legion. But, such as they are, we are not entertained sufficiently to linger long with our old friends. For as a rule, the Latin dictionary is (or was in my day) rather a melancholy-looking volume. If large, it was usually old and had a battered appearance. If small, its print was apt to be crabbed and, as it were, sour-looking; and its definitions were brief and limited to classical words. It would not even mention *proprietarius*. If a large volume included the word, " post-classical " was the annotation; and the definition or translation of it was uncompromisingly brief: " an owner, proprietor, proprietary." Thus are brushed aside all thoughts of tropical, colloquial, or technical peculiarities of meaning other than the legal one. Under various synonyms, one meaning only is asserted. The *proprietarius* is an owner, not merely a possessor *pro tempore*, administrator, or usufructuary. It would seem to follow that our seminarian, being an owner, is, with "all" other men, bound in fetters, howevermuch he may rebel against the hard fate that classes him with the " sui ipsius amatores ", the " cupidi ", the " gyrovagi ", and the other denominate worldlings who have clothed themselves in the garb of religious life.

Nevertheless, our seminarian may stoutly declare—as one energetic advertiser used to do — " There is hope! " After all, Thomas à Kempis wrote [1] for members either of his own little community or of his own religious institute. One soon perceives this in a perusal of the Third Book alone. For in its tenth chapter,[2] we find him thanking God for the grace of vocation to the monastic life: " Quid retribuam tibi pro gratia ista? Non enim omnibus datum est ut, omnibus abdicatis, saeculo renuntient et monasticam vitam assumant." May it not then be that he is picturing for his brethren their happier state than that of people who live " in the world " and are therefore subject to so many fettering distractions because of their ownership of property? Unfortunately for this pleasing solution of the difficulty, the thirty-second chapter represents a conversation between God and the faithful Brother of the Common Life. It is God who employs the word *proprietarii*, declaring that all such are bound in fetters, and that only by leaving all things may the Soul find all. To this the Soul replies, protesting that this is not the work of one day, nor is it child's play. The context, therefore, implies that the self-abnegation proposed is meant, not for people who live " in the world ", but even (and rather) for all those who already have taken the vow of poverty. But what, then, does *proprietarii* mean? There must be somewhere a solution of this difficulty. Our seminarian accordingly extends his research to still other editions of the Latin text.

---

[1] In employing the word " wrote ", I am not prejudging the controversy concerning the authorship either of the *Imitation* or of the " Third Book ", but I am merely referring to the Latin editions of the *Imitation*, as those editions are consulted ordinarily by priests or seminarians at the present time.

He finds an edition whose editor has evidently taken his task seriously. It has a Preface and a carefully-arranged Index of Subjects—in brief, an ascetical index. The editor has furthermore recognized that the text bristles with difficulties of style, and he has tried to obviate a large class of these by furnishing the reader with a greatly condensed, but laboriously compiled, list of expressions that smack of Dutch idiom. This also promises well. Once again, however, *proprietarii* goes without note or comment, after the fashion of the King James Bible. He has given some help—much more, indeed, than many editors have done or, even in our day, seem willing to do—and we thank him. We recognize that we are making some progress. The first edition we consulted had not even a Preface. The second had an extensive Preface giving much information in a general way. This third edition comes down to some of the difficulties encountered by a reader. *Pazienza!* There are yet larger Latin editions.

---

[2] The " Tenth Chapter " is omitted from the *Imitation* as edited by Albert Hyma "from hitherto undiscovered sources" (New York & London, 1927) and from " The Following of Christ: The Spiritual Diary of Gerard Groote (1340-1384), Founder of the Brethren and Sisters of the Common Life. Translated from original Netherlandish texts as edited by James van Ginneken, S.J., of the Catholic University of Nymegen, by Joseph Malaise, S.J." (New York, 1937). In the former of these two English translations our (Latin) " Chapter XXXII " is called " Chapter XXIV "; in the latter it is called " Chapter XXVI ". There seems to be a difference of opinion between these two editors as to the various amounts of matter to be omitted from the Latin version by Thomas à Kempis as not belonging to the recently discovered Netherlandish texts signalizing the composition of Gerard Groote.

Our seminarian may come upon one which, in addition to a good Preface and an Ascetical Index, has enriched each chapter with illustrative citations from Holy Scripture and with a concluding Prayer taken from some Father of the Church. The thirty-second chapter of the Third Book has no less than ten quotations from the Bible and a concluding *Oratio* from St. Augustine. It is clear that the editor here has spared himself no fatiguing labor. Nevertheless, he throws no light upon our puzzling word.

We are apparently making slow progress. Still, the happy thought occurred to one editor to annotate or illustrate the *Imitation* with extracts from the other works of Thomas à Kempis. After years of labor, this idea fructified in a volume which obtained immediate and extensive approval for its competent and patient editor. And his volume was reissued a decade of years later in a revised edition—for the idea embodied in the book was beautiful, appropriate, reassuring. It was obviously good. Let Thomas himself explain Thomas! The thirty-second chapter is thus illustrated by excerpts from five other works of Thomas, and more space is taken by these illustrations than the chapter itself occupies. The hope of enlightenment we cherish seems justified—but it is vain withal; for the illustrative extracts throw no light upon *proprietarii*, nor does the volume do so anywhere in its pages.

Two other Latin editions will attract attention. Both have a peculiar and scholarly purpose. Carl Hirsche's edition applies to the text of 1441 his own striking theory of the rhythmic and rhymic cadences, based on the strange punctuation of Thomas, which may have led Adrian de But, a Cistercian contemporary of Thomas, to his declaration that the *Imitation* was written "*metrice.*" But Hirsche does more than this. He places after each chapter illustrative quotations from the Bible, an "*argumentum*" with the verse-limits of its progress, and a "*dispositio Sommalii*" with similar indications of sections and verse-limits. His editorial labors were great, for they were detailed, minute, precise. In addition, he concluded his work with two summaries. One is "*Locorum parallelorum, biblicorum et aliorum, conspectus,*" occupying seven pages. The other is a "*Tabula locorum, quibus verba extremis syllabis consonantia cumulate occurrunt.*" This latter summary is directly in line with the major (and one might have thought the sole) purpose of his editorial labors. The other summary or conspectus is a work of supererogation but withal gladly to be welcomed by the reader. Nowhere does *proprietarii* figure as a puzzle to be solved, a riddle to be read, a difficulty to be obviated.

The other one of these two learnedly edited volumes is that of Michael Joseph Pohl. It is devoted almost exclusively to furnishing a correct text, with reformed spellings and forms of Latin words in the 1441 Autograph, and with very laborious "Epilegomena," "Adnotatio critica", etc. His table of Biblical references is marvellously extensive and exact. The volume will doubtless remain forever as the classically adequate edition of the Latin text of the *Imitation.* Puzzles such as our present one did not fall within the scope of his editing, and accordingly no attention is paid to *proprietarii.*

There are, of course, many editions of the Latin text. I have selected for examples only such ones as might seem to a reader to offer help in the interpretation of the Latin text. I have merely tried to show that the results of a reader's zealous consultation of such texts would probably prove disappointing. If such results should not prove disheartening as well, he may extend his research by consulting larger Latin dictionaries than the school-books thus far referred to—and so, for a few moments, we may join company with him while he hopefully takes from the shelf of some library the work of Forcellini.

This Facciolati-Forcellini work gives more references than the Freund-Andrews had furnished, but the net result appears to be about the same: "Proprietarius . . . *a proprietary, proprietor, possessor in his own right*, dicitur a JCtis, qui rei cujuspiam legitimum ac proprium dominium habet: et distinguitur a fructuario, cui usus, aut fructus rei tantummodo competit." Perhaps the riddle is thus made still more obscure. For the expression, "legitimum dominium", concurs with our own popular conception of proprietorship, but obviously does not fit in well, or possibily not at all, with the use of the word *pro-*

prietarii in the *Imitation*. How, namely, can a follower of the monastic rule vindicate to himself a *legitimum dominium*—a real, true and proper proprietorship of anything?

A last recourse will be had to Du Cange. The Glossarium ought to settle the question. And indeed it would seem to do so; for it has a special heading devoted, not to *proprietarius*, but to the exact word used in the *Imitation*, namely the plural number, *proprietarii*. And so our seminarian reads (doubtless not without astonishment): "Proprietarii, Monachi dicuntur, qui *proprium*, seu *proprietates*, ut loquitur Ekkehardus junior de Casib. S. Galli cap. 11. vel *peculia* possident. Jo. de Garlandia in Synonymis:

> Et opulentia, vel possessio, peculiumque,
> Res, et proprietas, hinc Proprietarius exstat.

Reinerus contra Valdenses pag. 95: *Beatus enim Gregorius pro Monacho Proprietario, sed poenitente, post mortem determinate 30. Missas celebrandas instituit, et sic eumdem liberavit.* Honorius III. lib. 4. Epist. 536: *Et quicunque de caetero inventus fuerit habere proprium, poenae subjaceat regulari, et semel in anno in Proprietarios solemnis excommunicatio proferatur.*" There is much more to a similar effect; indeed, nearly a column is given to the word. But there are two considerations that make the reader hesitate to ascribe this damnatory meaning to the word. Our seminarian notices that the references do not appear to be of later date than the thirteenth century. Thomas à Kempis wrote in the fifteenth century. Had not the decrees referred to by Du Cange attained their objectives long before that century—and if in some places they failed to do so, is it reasonably credible that such an abuse had begun to attain a foothold in a recently established religious institute whose members illustrated a wonderful fervor in self-renunciation? First fervor may not, it is true, last very long. But one little fact may indicate the perduring fervor of the Brethren of the Common Life. When, towards the close of the fifteenth century, an effort was made to rehabilitate the religiously decadent fortunes of the great Abbey of St. Victor, from Paris to Windesheim the call went forth for those who could best succeed in the onerous task. Even at that early date, it would appear that no blot rested on the escutcheon of the Dutch Canons Regular of St. Augustine. But Thomas à Kempis had either composed or, as able editors of recently discovered Netherlandish texts now contend, had merely edited (with additions of his own) and put into Latin the writings of the still earlier Gerard Groote. And thus we are led farther back towards the initial fervor of Groote himself.

What, then, did Groote mean by a Netherlandish idiom translated by à Kempis as *proprietarii*? Why does he mention this class first of all among those who are bound in fetters? *Compediti sunt omnes proprietarii et sui ipsius amatores, cupidi, curiosi, gyrovagi, quaerentes semper mollia, non quae Jesu Christi.* Was the abuse so flagrant and so common as this bad preëminence would seem to imply?

After his ordination to the priesthood, perhaps our seminarian's early perplexities of the *Imitation* (of which I have given only one example) may suggest the purchase of various translations of the Golden Book in English and in other languages. Will one of these perchance meet and solve his present difficulty? This question will be discussed in a succeeding paper.

H. T. Henry.

The Catholic University of America.

THE FORTHCOMING REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

II. The Need of a Revision.

TWO practical motives lead us in the first instance to consider the state of our vernacular Bible. Fundamentally we seek to protect the faithful from other versions in English which, in spite of their attractiveness, are erroneous and misleading. This motive, we recall, inspired most of the legislation in this country relative to the Scriptures. More positively, we should like to see our own version in such an acceptable and intelligible form that it might find in our lives the place it was intended to have. The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that the prevailing, the actual condition of our Catholic Bible in English leaves something to be desired, and consequently justifies the forthcoming revision.

When, however, we speak of revising the English Bible, it should not be supposed that we are starting off with a blanket condemnation of all previous revisions, as though they were entirely defective or dangerous. Even in its present form the English Bible used by Catholics cannot be put aside lightly. It is a safe guide in all matters of faith and morals. The numerous approbations of individual bishops, and the favor of our councils is sufficient evidence of this. For, although past efforts have not succeeded in giving us a perfect text, the Church has always been careful that we have a version that is at least orthodox. But further, that the current editions have other appreciable virtues can be admitted without hesitation. We owe them respect, above all, for their general accuracy, and for the fidelity with which they adhere to the Vulgate. In fact, for centuries our Catholic Bible presented the most reliable text of the New Testament available to those who read only English. Until 1881 the common Protestant version was based on the *Textus Receptus*, a Greek text which never compared with the Vulgate for fidelity, and which now has been almost entirely supplanted.[1] Although much has always been made of the English in this Anglican version, even by our revisors of the

---

[1] *A Grammar of the Vulgate*, by W. E. Plater and H. J. White, Oxford, 1926. On p. 7 these Protestant authors remark: "Where the Authorized and the Vulgate agree, the Authorized is, directly or indirectly, derived from the Vulgate; where they differ, the Vulgate is found usually on the side of later and fuller scholarship."

Douay, we should not forget that our own also has merit along these lines. The Douay-Rheims was highly praised for exactness and forcefulness of expression.[2] Subsequent revisions may not have completely preserved these qualities, and yet they too have a virility and smoothness of style that provoke imitation.

In spite of all this, the need of revising the Bible that we now read cannot be denied. This need has been felt all along, as we might learn from the numerous attempts at revision which appear in the story of the Bible in America, as outlined in the first of this series of articles (January number). If we are still inclined to see the need of an improvement, and thus imply the imperfection of these past revisions, we are far from questioning their motives, or even their ambitions. In most cases the thought was merely to provide an edition which would agree with the idiom of the time. That is also, in part, our ambition. But whilst on the work, we should like to go about it with the thoroughness that such an elevated subject warrants, and produce a revision that might be considered worthy in every respect.

Let it be said at once that the revision of the New Testament now in progress, and the prospect of revising the Old Testament, are both the result of practical experience with the inadequacy of our current editions. The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has had this experience in the study clubs which it has organized for the more serious reading of the New Testament. The average reader finds it difficult to take up the Bible; and when he does, he finds the reading of it anything but easy. Others have known and felt this for a long time. The professor of Scripture has seen that the text in its present condition is not clear, and hence that it could stand revision. Comparison is still made of our editions with the Revised version, and the comparison is not complimentary to the Catholic text. Such experiences have inevitably led to the question of why we are patient with the condition of our text. They have also led to the conclusion that if we want the Bible read by our people, if we want it understood by those who read it, we must present it in a language and dress that will be found more attractive and comprehensible.

[2] Cfr. ECCL. REV. 63 (1920, 2) 519-30.

In such a project, of course, there is room for modesty. We must not be too ambitious, we must not promise too much. The difficulty experienced in reading the Bible is due as much to the obscurity of its spiritual message, or to the slowness of the human mind to grasp such thoughts, as it is to the character of the language in which it is presented. No revision, therefore, will succeed entirely in removing this obscurity. Ambition to do so has often led to the perversion of the original message. Hence, continued study and prayerful trust in God will always remain a requirement of profitable reading of the Scriptures. The language, however, has something to do with the intelligibility of the text, and if an improvement of this will help in our present case, we feel some obligation to undertake it.

There are two features of the current text in which we feel this improvement is possible. The first is the matter of the variety in which our version is current. The second includes all questions of language and expression, not merely their correspondence with our present idiom, but also their fidelity to the original. In pointing these out, the instances to be cited are given not so much as evidence or proof, but rather as illustrations of the charges we bring against the current text.

1.

Attention was called in our first article (January number) to the variety of sources from which the texts published in this country have been taken. The condition that resulted was one to which our Councils never quite reconciled themselves. We can understand why they should not. Such variants in a current text always occasion a degree of uncertainty. But there was another and more serious reason. Each of the editions claimed to be an improvement on the others and thus weakened their authority. To appreciate what this meant, we must recall that Challoner's revision had been made for the mid-eighteenth century. The Troy Bible, issued some forty years later, pretended to be a modern improvement on Challoner, and hence of greater value. And thus each new revision sought to replace the others without ever being entirely successful. As these existed side by side, another source of confusion was added by those who prepared them for the press in America. J. G. Shea observes that the Pictorial New Testament and an edition of

Haydock's Challoner, both prepared by the Rev. J. McMahon, were really new translations.[3] It was not merely, therefore, the fact of an uncertain reading that caused the trouble, it was also the fact that one edition was depreciating the authority of the other.

Illustration of this is abundant. One need only compare representatives of the revisions on which our editions rested. Two are given here. The first is from the Thomas Kelly edition of Haydock's text, published in 1855, and approved by the American hierarchy. The other, issued in New York, 1868, is from P. O'Shea's edition of an Irish revision, approved by the hierarchy of Ireland to supplant the Troy Bible.

I	II
Jn. 4:1-5.	Jn. 4:1-5.
1 When, therefore, Jesus understood that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus maketh more disciples, and baptizeth more than John,	1 When Jesus therefore understood that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus maketh more disciples and baptiseth more than John,
2 (Though Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples,)	2 (Though Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples,)
3 He left Judea, and departed again into Galilee.	3 He left Judea and went again into Galilee.
4 And it was necessary that he should pass through Samaria.	4 And he was of necessity to pass through Samaria.
5 He cometh, therefore, to a city of Samaria which is called Sichar; near the piece of land[4] which Jacob gave to his son Joseph.	5 He cometh therefore to a city of Samaria which is called Sichar; near the land which Jacob gave to his son Joseph.

We may observe of this comparison that it reveals a difference in reading which, although not serious, is striking enough for an historical book. Still greater divergence will be found on comparing these editions in the Epistles. Further, we notice that the changes introduced into the second text do not touch the real difficulties of the first, to which we shall call attention later. The revision is concerned almost entirely with the English expression which, for spelling and punctuation, follows the English and not the American practice. We may admit, therefore, that it really was not a great improvement over the other, and certainly had no greater claim on the confidence of the faithful.

---

[3] J. G. Shea, *A Bibliographical Account of Catholic Bibles, etc.*, Cramoisy Press, New York, 1859, p. 7.

[4] Other editions read "piece of ground".

Our more recent editions, now being printed and sold in this country, have to some extent bettered this situation. At least the same variety of readings will not be found, except when the text is compared with the editions of the last century. This is due partly to the fact that the industry of setting type for Bibles in English has become rather centralized. Brepols, in Belgium, does most of this work. And still there are differences, remarked at once in the matter of spelling and punctuation.

But if we have of late come closer to a uniform text, without reaching it altogether, we have fallen into another difficulty which is equally embarrassing. Inquiry, made directly of our publishers of Bibles, has brought to light that we have to-day no credible assurance of the source from which our text has been derived. We are assured in one instance that the edition is an exact copy of the Douay-Rheims, which of course is from the start doubtful. Another is called a revision of the Douay, but earlier than Challoner's, which also can hardly be accepted. When comparison is made of these two editions, they are found to have exactly the same text, differing only in punctuation, the work, probably, of an editor. For some time an Irish revision, issued under the authority of Bishop Denvir, was offered for sale by one of our publishers. This is now discontinued. For the most part our editions have been drawn from Haydock's edition of Challoner, the changes being minor.

To the lack of uniformity which still exists, even if with mitigation, there is added this further note of uncertainty. All of these facts, brought together, convince us that the difficulty can be cleared up only by a revision. To adopt any one of the many revisions already done might take care of the variations in reading. But this still would leave us dependent upon a text that for many reasons may be considered unsatisfactory.

2.

It has been observed that the history of our Bible in the United States manifests clearly that we have never been perfectly content with its condition. Both the references in our Councils to the need of an improvement, and the tendency to adopt revisions convince us of this, and at the same time tell us that the discontent was not merely with the variety in which our text was current. Frequent mention is also made of its want of accuracy. Sometimes this might mean nothing more than carelessness on the part of the printer. O'Callaghan remarks that many such errors crept into our American texts, and that corrections were required with each subsequent edition.[5] But, as we know from Archbishop Kenrick, the objection went still deeper.[6] Such typographical inaccuracies would not have called for the rather complete revisions which responded to this discontent. A new edition, more carefully prepared, would have eliminated such errors, even when they were as serious as the omission of verses.[7] We may conclude that the frequent suggestion of an emended text in the past rose out of motives such as we have to mention here. We are, therefore, not alone, nor breaking new ground, when we offer the following criticism of our present text. We can illustrate our objections which hold that the language of our current Bible is not as clear as it might be, and that it is not always strictly faithful in giving the sense of the Vulgate.

The state of the language in our present editions of the Bible is the first thing to which our attention is called. It is true that we are not confronted with the obsolescence that induced Challoner's revision. The reader in 1749 might find reason to complain of the language in Rheims. For example:

Jn. 5:27: And incontinent his disciples came; and they marveled that he talked with a woman. No man for all that said, What seekest thou, or why talkest thou with her.
4:54: This again the second sign did Jesus, when he came from Jewrie into Galilee.
5:2 : And there is at Hierusalem upon Probatica a pond which in Hebrew is surnamed Bethsaida.

---

[5] E. B. O'Callaghan, *A List of Editions of the Holy Scriptures, etc.*, Munsell and Rowland, Albany, 1861.

[6] Cfr. Eccl. Rev., 98 (1938) 42-50.

[7] Cfr. Eccl. Rev. 92 (1935) 395-98.

Such readings Challoner succeeded in making more conformable to the idiom of his time. But there remain at least some reasons why we should not be content with Challoner's idiom. He wrote for the England of almost two hundred years ago, and we must admit that in this time the language has been modified at least to some extent. Moreover, Challoner, and those who followed him in the work of revising the Douay Bible, were admittedly influenced by the King James Bible. Now although this exemplar of good English was completely revised in 1881, we are left carrying the idiom of the rejected text.

More specifically, however, we may observe that our text is hampered by the retention of obsolete forms and expressions. This is a surface difficulty, and not hard to correct. For many readers, however, it makes the text not only unattractive, but also obscure. For this reason alone we should correct it. Attention to even this feature of the present editions would do much to bring them into conformity with our current idiom, and it could be done without making the language " pedestrian prose ".

Looking beneath the surface, we must also admit that our text is not always clear in its language, nor is it always correct. Both of these imperfections might have been caused orginally by the revisors holding too closely to the style of the Latin text. The length and sweep of a classical sentence were not as disturbing to the contemporaries of Challoner as they might be to-day. This did not justify the retention of the weak grammar that marked the common speech in which the original was written, especially when, in our language, it results in obscurities. There is no sufficient reason, for instance, why we should not recast such sentences as the following:

> Jn. 20:14: When she had thus said, she turned herself back and saw Jesus standing: and she knew not that it was Jesus.
> 18: Mary Magdalen cometh and telleth the disciples: I have seen the Lord; and these things he said to me.
> 27: Then he saith to Thomas: Put in thy finger hither and see my hands.

These illustrations are taken almost at random, without effort to select the more notorious. They do not affect the sense in the way many others do, especially such as are taken from the Epistles. In each case here we see the Latin still peeping through the English, although this English has been gone over several times before it reached the edition from which these verses were culled. In the citation from Jn. 20: 27, if we read farther, we come upon another inexactness in the word " faithless ". The first meaning of the term is still what the Vulgate says; but in general use it has shown preference for the secondary meaning of " false " or " untrustworthy ". We must take this also into consideration. The modern professor of English might discover numerous examples of such changes in the meaning of words which actually make the older editions, and our current text generally, fail to give the sense of the Vulgate. In this way we should call attention to the term " meat " which occurs so often in the Gospels, e. g. in the sixth chapter of St. John, and for which we must use the term "food".

More serious still would be the instances in which our text renders the Latin incorrectly. We do not insist upon these, for they are not frequent. In Acts 2: 6, for example, the words, *Facta autem hac voce*, are translated "And when this was noised abroad . . . ". That is not the meaning, and is not to be found either in the original Rheims or in the Protestant versions. More disturbing also are the cases in which the influence of the King James Bible has led our revisors away from the Vulgate. A slight example of this might be adduced from Acts 2: 31. Our text reads, " Foreseeing this he spoke of the resurrection of Christ '. " This " is found in neither the Greek nor the Latin. It had been supplied by the King James version, and thence taken over by our revisors. Other such instances of a more serious nature could be indicated, but for the most part our text is faithful enough to the Vulgate. In fact, when we recall the extent to which all our revisors, from Challoner to Kenrick, respected and followed the King James version, it is surprising that more of this influence has not been experienced.

To these objections against the language of our current text, all of which have been recognized for some time, we are now adding some complaint against its external form. The difficulty created by the chapter and verse typography in which all editions are now printed is not as unimportant as it might be thought. The form is now peculiar to the Bible, and is not always easy to follow. We are accustomed to the logical division which is known as the paragraph and the sentence, and we miss it when we turn to the Scriptures. But further, the actual application of chapter and verse often interferes with the sense of the passage. Thus in the passage cited above, Jn. 4: 1-5, it will be observed that the first three verses are parts of the one sentence, and yet their separation is made certain by each beginning with a capital letter. Instances of this are most frequent, and often still more disturbing. The chapters as well cannot always be taken as logical divisions. Most chapters could be divided into several paragraphs. Sometimes it happens that the thought unit is contained partly in two chapters. This is true of Jn. 7: 53, which should be read as the first sentence in the paragraph which continues through 8: 1.

With such interferences evident, there is no adequate reason why we should hold on to the present form. To start with, neither chapter nor verse had part in the original autograph, or even in the versions for many centuries after the original was written. The chapters as we have them now were introduced in the thirteenth century, the verses not until Robert Stephen's edition of the Greek New Testament in 1551. The Rheims New Testament, like all the Protestant versions before the Genevan, was in paragraph form. Our modern editions of the Vulgate have gone back to the paragraphs in which the earlier editions were printed. The adoption of the current chapter and verse form was an advantage neither to the Vulgate nor to our editions from Challoner on.

While, therefore, we allow that there is much to be praised in the editions of the English Bible current in the United States, we cannot help recognizing their defects. Anyone acquainted with the text will be able to supplement the charges we have brought here, and also to multiply the cited examples. What we have offered, however, should be sufficient to illustrate the dissatisfaction with the current text out of which has grown the ambition to improve it by a new revision. Admitting the difficulty of such a revision, we do not feel that we are too ambitious in thinking that the Scriptures can be turned into clearer English and more appreciable form.

WILLIAM L. NEWTON.

Cleveland, Ohio.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

BLUFFING MEN OUT OF CHRISTIANITY.

Whoever reads modern writers with a critical eye cannot help observing that in literary originality, as well as in intellectual integrity, many are painfully deficient. Outside of the sphere of fiction in which authors are necessarily disciplined by a public grown more and more fastidious and exacting, modern writers display an astonishing dullness. And this is especially true of those who like to dabble in social, religious or philosophical fields; of protagonists of new codes of ethics; and in a particular manner of some university professors who court popular acclaim, and aspire to regulate, and sometimes even to dictate the bounds of popular culture.

But it is amongst the popular psychologists, sociologists, and general culture experts that, I think, the worst offenders against good taste and sound logic are to be discovered. Off the presses run volumes innumerable, purporting to aid the average citizen to " adjust " himself socially and psychologically; and for readers who desire a smattering of culture on short order, there is no lack of treatises—potpourris of decadent esthetics, and dubious ethics spiced with the psychology in vogue. And loudly, and stridently, through the medium of printer's ink their creators emphasize and proclaim their modernity.

A particular expression of this modernity we find in an assumption of intellectual and cultural superiority—really a false superiority, having its roots in a collective inferiority complex. Such writers as we have in mind never weary of bombarding their readers with insistences upon the superiority of the present. Go where you will amongst these extreme modernists, rarely can you escape this parrot-like emphasis upon the ascendancy of the present over the past. Everything is to be judged by modern standards; of all things the modern viewpoint, and only that, must be the ultimate criterion. That which is modern is desirable and good; what is not modern is undesirable and evil.

Some of the methods, however, by which these " modern " writers would urge upon us the desirability of their attitudes and their theories are, to say the least, open to much criticism. To immature minds—and of such, of course, there are many—their methods might seem expressive of unbounded confidence. And yet, by very reason of such over-assurance, there must be an occasional reader making judgments for himself, who will be led to suspect that in their hearts these " apostles of progress " are really very uncertain of themselves. In love with their ideas, it is nevertheless, not impossible that they are harried with an uneasy feeling that fundamentally, such ideas are not practical. And so, it may be, this doubt of themselves compels them to make an arrogant " front " or in plain language, to bluff.

A critical analysis of the technique of these writers reveals that a considerable number of them incline to employ similar tactics in their efforts to influence and distort the judgment of their readers. Their methods may be reduced to three heads:

a) intellectual intimidation;
b) use of certain platitudes;
c) studied vagueness.

If we examine the method of intellectual intimidation, we we shall find predominating the rather effective device of " name-calling," that is, the showering of uncomplimentary or opprobrious terms upon opponents or opposing ideals. For example, a writer attacking institutional religion may express himself in this manner: " A vastly greater number of minds are to-day set free from dogma, superstition, and childish deference to authority." Now, to some readers, such a sentence can appear fraught with much weight and solemnity; and the impression may be conveyed that to be in sympathy with what is so depreciated, is a little discreditable to one of enlightened views.

The following, again, comes from an author criticizing belief in Christianity: " However mystical we may be in other respects, we have become too naturalistic, and too observant to accept the time-honored explanations." Observe that here the adjective time-honored becomes undesirable, and is shown as the antithesis of the desirable terms: *observant,* and *naturalistic.*

And again: " The fiction of infallibility is very common, and those who have not learned to doubt this fiction are, as a rule, the more ignorant and provincial elements of the population."

The following can be quite terrifying: " The average man's reasoning consists chiefly of the repetition of cant phrases in support of preconceived ideas. He wishes to hear only what he can applaud, and he applauds what saves his face, and puts his enemies to shame. *Theological disputation has always been carried on in this spirit.*" Who wants to be just an average man? The manner of leaving the inevitable alternative is, it must be admitted, rather artistic.

Again: " As usual in unhealthy reasoning, the thinking in this case is a syllogism." The suggestion is, of course, that sound citizens must beware of syllogisms, and all their works and pomps. To a shallow reader such intimidation can be fearful.

Of great effect is another device which we might call the Appeal to Culture. Here, the author pays court to the vanity of his reader. For example: " It is inconceivable that any truly cultured man can give assent to such an outmoded code of ethics."—" Though, without doubt, religious systems can be profitable to the masses, the man of enlightenment and culture will have learned to look upon them as rationalizations of the wish-fancy of the mob."—" The cultured man, liberated as he is, from the shackles of primitive dogma, and conventional morality, chooses to live his own life in conformity with, and in response to his own peculiar needs."—" It has always been the characteristic of truly cultured and historic figures that they rose superior to the dictates of petty morality."

A very popular device of authors prone to intellectual intimidation is the Appeal to Authority. Indeed, one can hardly take up a book dealing with social, philosophical or religious questions, written in this style, without being deluged with quotations. Thus:

" According to Dr. X of the Institute of Y . . .
" Dr. W. the noted anthropologist says . . ."
" Prof. A. the famous and learned psychologist says . . ."
" That able historian Prof. B. says . . ."

"Scientists tell us . . ."
"Psychologists tell us . . .:
"Anthropologists tell us . . ."
"Geologists tell us . . ."

And so it goes, until at last the reader begins to wonder just who is writing the book: the author or his authorities. It will be observed that this method is used with great results also in the field of advertising, where appeal to authorities in this or that sphere is frequently resorted to, principally to frighten people into buying what is advertised, by persuading them that the possession of the product is essential to their well-being in some way or other, perhaps to health or social integrity.

If the authorities quoted agree with the mind of the author, and usually they do, they are praised and complimented very graciously. Their authority apparently increases with the number of nice things said about them. And like young children some writers incline to conceive of such complacent authorities in superlatives.

But woe to the authority that does not agree with them! Either he is ignored if his reputation be too great to allow of disparagement, or he is cast into exterior darkness if he has no special repute. Thus: "Prof. X. holds that . . . but the majority of reputable scientists are agreed. . . ."

Or he may be damned with faint praise often by having the best of motives imputed to him: "Though Dr. S. has made commendable efforts to effect a reconciliation between dogma and some aspects of scientific research it is clear that he vainly attempts to escape an impossible dilemma."

It may be, also, that the savant is out of touch with things: "Dr. W. does not seem to be aware that the trend of opinion is now veering away from this position."

And sometimes, even the full force of holy indignation is released: "It cannot be denied that Father W. has contributed much to Science. But it must be remembered that Father W. is really a dual personality. He is a Jesuit scientist, and the Jesuit always checks the conclusions of the Scientist."

Another method of wielding the intellectual club consists in laying down a series of dogmatic propositions enunciated with pompous and pontifical solemnity. Thus: "Evolution is as firmly established as the Law of Gravitation."—"Theologians are less acrimonious, and Scholasticism has long been on the decline."—" The doctrine of creation still survives among uneducated people. Such a view of the origin of living things could only have arisen in a state of almost complete ignorance." —" A most profound and comprehensive demonstration of human achievement was placed before us when it was shown that man has not crawled down from a being that was almost a god, but has struggled up from a creature which was not even an ape."

Then we have the " patronizing " method. The writer's pet abominations are damned by a species of contrast. The object of loathing, perhaps a theory or a doctrine, is contemptuously dismissed by being brought in at the end of a sentence by way of comparison with something else. The advantage of this method is that the condemnation seems merely incidental, and therefore has the keener edge. Thus: " This theory though in favor for a time must now be discarded: it is as impossible of serious consideration as the myth of *Original Sin*."—" To regard values as absolute and static is the hallmark of a medieval mind engrossed with the fiction of the terrors of *Hell*."

And sometimes the writer has visions of the future which he passes on to his readers. The prophetic revelations are usually concerned with the eventual extinction of hostile ideals or institutions. " The endeavor to institutionalize a thing so intimate and personal as mating . . . will be abandoned as mankind becomes more progressive."—" It is, of course, certain that with the extension of our views, and the progress in the sciences, organized religion will, in time, become obsolete."

The " prophetic " device has immense appeal for the " progressive " type of reader who longs to be " up with the times ", and sometimes, even beyond them.

Next we have the " guessing contest ". This is not strictly an intimidating device, but it deserves mention. The " guessing contest " is employed where a writer has some peculiar type of nonsense to present for consideration which he deems unwise to lay down apodictically. Some scientists and historians are prone to its use. Thus: " *We may guess* that fifty million years have elapsed since this earth of ours came into existence."—" One can imagine with what thrills of adventure our webfooted ancestors crept through the mud of the seashore to colonize the dry land, and begin their long climb upwards."—"It was the Jesuits, *I am told,* who first made practical application of the axiom that the end justifies the means."

We may conclude our analysis of the Intellectual Intimidation method with a brief mention of the Appeal to the Age. Here, ideals, philosophies, institutions of the Past, or which have come down from the past, are compared unfavorably with so-called new ideals. For example: " Present-day thinkers cannot avail themselves of concepts and beliefs which in the past were employed to rationalize and neutralize evil."—" In the light of our present development, insistence on the values of an outmoded metaphysic cannot be acceptable."—" Obsolete systems of dogma and morality cannot, in this present era of enlightenment, compel the allegiance of mature minds."

Akin to the Appeal to the Age is the " braggadocio " device which consists of a steady bombardment of the reader with the various achievements of the age, and then suggesting that certain traditional ways of thought and action are no longer expedient for the demi-gods of the Present. Thus: " We have seen a million light-years away. Our telescopes can now view objects three hundred and fifty million light-years away. So keen are our instruments of scientific research that we can examine organisms so minute that when a drop of blood containing them is diluted about five million times, they can still be powerful enough to affect an organism seriously. We have learned that our galaxy contains one hundred thousand flaming suns. Astronomers tell us that Vega is nearing us at eight miles a second, Aldebaran receding at thirty-three miles a second, and Arcturus crossing space at eighty-four miles a second. In view of such progress, it seems unreasonable that we should still be expected to regulate our social and private lives according to the exigencies of a system of primitive myth and magic."

And this last device seems to be rather successful, for hardly a modern writer of the type we are discussing, can refrain from it.

In the vocabularies of these writers we find a number of stock phrases and epithets which vary little from one to another. These platitudes and phrases we might reduce to the following classification: a) " Stink-bombs; " b) " Decorations; " c) "Laurel-wreaths." As to the " stink-bombs," they are surprisingly few. This, possibly, may be due to the fact that one copies them from another, picking them up as they come, so to speak, and storing them away for future use. The " stink-bombs " are employed to disorganize opponents. The more common are: Adjectives: " benighted," " medieval ", " unenlightened ", " unscientific ", " gullible ", " unprogressive," " narrow-minded ", " anthropomorphic ", " pious ", " otherworldly ", " reactionary ", " intolerant ", " primitive ", " outmoded ", " obsolete ", " immature ", " prejudiced ", " doctrinaire ", " conventional ", " childish ", " superstitious ", " provincial ". Substantives: " bigot ", " supernaturalist ", " fanatic ", " fundamentalist ", " corruptionist ", " obscurantist ", " introvert ", " propagandist ", " hypocrite ", " cultural fossil ", " barbarian ", " coercionist ", " reformer ", " tyrant ", " reactionary ". Phrases: " Blind faith ", " Christian mythology ", " primitive myth and magic ", " medieval superstition ", " Dogma and superstition ", " Doctrinaire Scholasticism ", " totems and tabus ", " sham and cant ", " wish-fancy ", " time-honored codes ", " declining influence of Scholasticism ", " fiction of infallibility ", " Hell's waning prestige ", " primitive mysticism ", " ignorance and superstition ", " traditional morality ", " slavish morality ", " absurd asceticism ", " pious ignorance ", " dogmatic fabrications ", " metaphysical futilities ".

Next, the " decorations ", which, incidentally, are pretty well done to death. These are words or phrases designed to stamp their use as one who is modern and sophisticated, and are of advantage in impressing the reader. They could, I suppose, be classed as " fine-writing ". " Emotional perspective ", " cultural values ", " new modes of response ", " organic totality ", " the meaning and possibilities of living ", " recreation of values ", " creative consciousness ", " spiritual significance ", " cultural *èlan* ", " creative effort ", " emotional reactions ", " psychic attitudes ", " basic needs ", " fuller awareness ", " world-view ", " symbolic urges ", " streams of consciousness ", " cultural progress ". The adjective " basic " applied *ad infinitum.* The adjective " full-fuller " applied *ad nauseam.* " Deeply " and " definitely " applied indefinitely. " Rich-richer." For this adjective and its comparative a species of mania seems to have developed, and not alone amongst these writers. It is made to run the gauntlet of the substantives.

Philosophers and theologians, otherwise unblemished, fall victims to it, and even the Communists have taken it up. Possibly only the Shakers, the Holy Rollers and H. L. Mencken have so far kept it at bay, but there is no absolute guarantee that even they too may not, in time, succumb to its fatal allure.

Finally, come the " laurel-wreaths ", reserved for " nice " people. Here we have: " thoughtful ", " enlightened ", " progressive ", " brilliant ", " noted ", " famous ", " liberal ", " modern ", " leading intellects ", " prominent ", " representative scholars ", " truly civilized ", " men of intellectual integrity ", " men of vision ", " well-poised ", " champion of freedom ", " reasonable ", " eminent ", " master-minds ", " outstanding champions of progress ".

Many of our writers display a shrewd sense of psychology. They are, for example, keenly appreciative of the inherent craving for mystery in human nature, and are very skilful in exploiting it. People who are not too well educated, or those whose thinking is confused, are frequently tempted to admire what they do not fully understand. To respond to this trait, we have, in the author, the *vague* style: the use of a multiplicity of adjectives; of formidable and learned expressions; of certain words which have pleasant sounds; all transposed, arranged and compounded as to present the maximum of volume with a minimum of clarity. In this way, ideas may be advanced, which if clearly apprehended, might awaken strongly the sense of the ridiculous, but which, smothered in verbiage, tend to convey an impression of mysterious profundity. Example: "That which is proximately fundamental is an event-particle. An event-particle is the limiting case of a motion. There is also a motion-quality which is just pure motion. Motion does not imply anything that moves. It is anterior to things. Space-time is an abstraction from motion. The event-particle is half-way between space and time ". Or again: " Reality . . . is the Protean offspring of the psychic embraces of every sensibility that exists with the original plastic life-stuff."

A modern culture expert on El Greco: " Wildly and grandly do they whirl up in their mounting crescendo of mystical self-forgetfulness, these holy El Greco saints! As with the figures of Dostoievsky there is something apocalyptic about these luminous lacerations toppling on the verge of an unutterable threshold; but the imaginative backgrounds that the Toledoan gives them: racks of strange vapors, icebergs of huddled chaos, chasms of fatality, anticipate again and again those hosts of primordial air-shapes which William Blake saw in the fields of London's suburbs."

A modern scientist's idea of God: " like the risen Osiris who, after an interval of struggle, suffering and defeat, died that he might live again in glory, the Divine Imaginal descends into imperfection and conflict, and re-arises, is redeemed, and redeems itself as a conscious god. And since God is a society of sentients, and finite sentients are each and all evolved, the evolution of God is seen to be the compensation for that corruption of eternity in which the world-process began."

From our analysis we can, I think, now reach this conclusion: the procedure of many modern writers is, in general, irrational, that is, they do not noticeably rely upon reason in any form, to support their contentions. Reason will not lend itself to their aid. And, in default, they are forced to depend upon what in the last analysis is reducible to assumptions. They overawe by assumptions. In brief, they bluff.

Yet, it would be unfair to deny that they bluff most artistically. And here, we should be willing to give them credit for something quite original. Whether it be good, or bad, it is plain that they have really made a contribution to the world. They have raised bluffing to the dignity of a liberal art.

JOHN COYNE.

Los Angeles, California.

PROTESTANTS AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The Very Reverend Henry D. Buchanan's article, "Protestants and the Communion of Saints," reminds me of an incident that occurred when the bishop of our diocese was visiting a certain parish. A wealthy man had built a summer home in the vicinity, and a number of his friends were visiting him. In fact, they were trying to develop a mine, and they wanted us all to see their wonderful structures. In the morning, the altar-stone of a new church was blessed and laid, and most of the visitors had been present when the bishop spoke, explaining the ceremonies and the founding of a church by the Redeemer of mankind. Two of the group were always discussing different questions, and it was evident that they could never agree. The bishop was, by nature, not loquacious, and thus the two men found the opportunity to engage in their favorite pastime. After a rather good sally, which the host seemed to think was excellent, he said, " Your Lordship " (using the then accepted term in addressing a bishop in these parts), " I hope you do not mind our tilts. There must be something like this in heaven. I like to have a friendly argument. If they do not argue in heaven or do nothing there but sing and play on harps, I don't want to go there, or I hope I shan't have to stay there long." The bishop, on being asked his opinion whether he thought there might not be some such diversion in heaven, simply smiled and said, " Well, well, now, there is something there for everyone to like." I was then a young priest, and would have launched out on a learned dissertation on the joys in heaven as given by St. Paul and St. Thomas, only that my superior was addressed. But, as Father Buchanan so well puts it, " a general reference to everlasting bliss means practically nothing to a man whose experience of happiness is largely confined to the physical, and who knows that even these agreeable sensations of pleasure will pall upon him eventually if they last too long."

Some time ago, the daughter of a dear friend of mine died, and was to be buried the day we were visiting the little town. As we were passing the open door of the church where the funeral was held, we heard the text, " Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, for henceforth they shall rest from their labors," and the Presbyterian minister whom we had often heard at our literary club, and whose knowledge of the Fathers of the Church and of St. Thomas and many other Doctors was more extensive than is generally found among the clergy of any denomination, for he had been educated in the best universities in Scotland, was starting his funeral oration. It was all on the Communion of the Saints, and it was essentially Catholic doctrine. He said that we are all members of the same body, engrafted on the same Vine, Jesus Christ, and he said that even if physical death overtakes one of us, we still live as members of that Mystical Body, deriving life and joy from its Head, who is Jesus Christ.

Our village has eighty Catholics, and three ministers—the United Church, the Presbyterian, and a retired missionary of Corea. When the Catholic doctor died on Christmas, all were grieved, and they came in a body to the funeral. There was not even standing room in the church, which seats comfortably 200 people. I did not have time to submit the case to the bishop, but I could offer my sympathy to the wife, father and brothers of the deceased. I explained that I could not preach a funeral oration, and that the mind of the Church was to help the soul on its way to the Creator and to its final destiny, and that Mass was therefore offered for the repose of the soul of the deceased, who was loyal to the practices of his holy religion. It would seem reasonable to suppose that God would not keep away eternally from His presence one who had been faithful in everything, but still did not reach the standard of perfection and loyalty necessary to be admitted immediately into the happiness of heaven. If the doctor needed help he would, like Job suffering, cry out: "Have pity, have pity, at least you, my friends." Therefore it was that I had come that morning fasting, in order to offer up, and the people too offered up, the Sacrifice which Christ offered on Calvary for the atonement of the sins of mankind. The people were pleased and consoled, and many of them who were there for the first time when the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered, said that it was very nice, and they all liked it, and one or two of them said, "I wish we had the Mass in our church."

We must sympathize with our non-Catholic brethren; many of them are charitable and sincere, and would be Catholics to-day if they were not born Protestants.

D. J. Rankin.

Iona, N. S., Canada.

CONFIRMATION BEFORE FIRST COMMUNION.

Qu. The decree "*Quam singulari*" states: "Aetas discretionis, tum ad Confessionem tum ad Sacram Communionem ea est, in qua puer incipit ratiocinari, hoc est circa septimum annum, sive supra, sive etiam infra. Ex hoc tempore incipit obligatio satisfaciendi utrique praecepto Confessionis et Communionis."

On the other hand, Canon Law (c. 788) determines that the age for Confirmation is seven. This ruling is not a mere counsel but a command. (Cf. Commission for Interpretation, 16 June, 1931—*A.A.S.*, XXIII [1931], 353.)

The Sacred Congregation of Sacraments declares: ". . . equidem opportunum esse et conformius naturae et effectibus sacramenti Confirmationis, pueros ad sacram mensam prima vice non accedere nisi post receptum Confirmationis sacramentum, quod est veluti complementum Baptismatis et in quo datur plenitudo Spiritus Sancti (S. Thomas, p. III, quaestio 72, art. 2); non tamen iidem censendi sunt prohiberi quominus ad eamdem mensam prius admittantur, si ad annos discretionis pervenerint, quamvis Confirmationis sacramentum antea accipere non potuerunt." (*A.A.S.*, XXIV [1932], 271.) Non prohibentur . . . Ergo (*non tenentur*)."

How does this obligation in conscience affirmed by the decree *Quam singulari* harmonize with the *Non prohibentur* of the Sacred Congregation of Sacraments?

Resp. In the earliest centuries of the Church it was customary to confer the sacrament of Confirmation soon, if not immediately, after Baptism, even upon infants before they attained the age of reason. But with the spread of Christianity and the establishment of extensive dioceses this practice ceased in the West, whereas it still obtains in most Oriental rites, priests being empowered to confirm immediately after the baptism even of infants.

The later custom in the Latin rite preferred that Confirmation be administered soon after children reached the age of reason, though it permitted that the sacrament be administered even earlier in case of danger of death or for other grave reasons. In many places, however, especially in more extensive dioceses, the impossibility of the bishop's confirming the children as soon as they attained the age of reason compelled a postponement of Confirmation until as late as the twelfth or fourteenth year. Unfortunately, particularly after the rise of Jansenism, some failed to realize that this did not conform to the ideals of the Church and did not rest upon a theological basis but arose from necessity, despite the fact that the Church expressed itself repeatedly and unmistakably in this regard.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Benedict XIV, instr. *Eo quamvis tempore,* 4 May 1745, § 6—*Fontes,* n. 357; encycl. *Anno vertente,* 19 June 1750, § 4—*Fontes,* n. 407; encycl. *Allatae sunt,* 26 July 1755, § 22—*Fontes,* n. 434; Leo XIII, letter *Abrogata,* 22 June 1897—*Fontes,*

In conformity with this custom canon 788 ordains: "Licet sacramenti confirmationis administratio convenienter in Ecclesia Latina differatur ad septimum circiter aetatis annum, nihilominus etiam antea conferri potest, si infans in mortis periculo sit constitutus, vel ministro id expedire ob justas et graves causas videatur." The wording of this canon is such that it might easily be construed as not laying down a precept regarding the age for administering Confirmation.[2] Therefore upon repeated requests the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Code declared it unlawful to administer Confirmation before the confirmand had reached the age of about seven years, except for the reasons mentioned in canon 788.[3]

After this declaration some authors took a rather strict view regarding customs of confirming infants. While the Sacred Congregation of Sacraments did not press the point strictly, it urged that in the absence of grave and just causes the faithful should be properly instructed regarding the common law of the Church in this matter.[4] From this reply the Sacred Congregation took occasion to anticipate a possible error which might creep in, and it is just regarding this point that our inquirer seeks information.

The whole trend of the Church's practice has been that Confirmation should be conferred after the confirmand has attained the use of reason but before he receives First Holy Communion. If Confirmation is not to be administered before the age of about seven years, it will frequently be impossible to confer it before children have reached an appreciably higher age of, say, ten, twelve, fourteen or even more years. In this event some might be tempted to argue that, since Confirmation ought in the usual course to precede First Communion, the latter should always be delayed until after Confirmation, even though this

---

n. 634; S. C. S. Off., 1782—*Fontes*, n. 844; 11 December 1850, ad 12—*Fontes*, n. 913; S. C. C., 12 March and 23 April 1774—*Fontes*, n. 3788; S. C. P. F., instr. 4 March 1774—*Fontes*, n. 4565; J. P. Bock, "Welches Alter ist im Sinne der Kirche das geeignetste zum Empfange der Firmung?", *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*, LXVIII (1915), 602-625.

[2] Maroto, "Animadversiones", *Apollinaris*, V (1932), 266-268.

[3] "III. DE AETATE CONFIRMANDORUM

"D. An canon 788 ita intelligendus sit ut sacramentum Confirmationis in Ecclesia latina ante septimum circiter aetatis annum conferri non possit nisi in casibus, de quibus in eodem canone.

"R. *Affirmative*," 16 June 1931—A. A. S. XXIII (1931), 353.

[4] 27 February, 1932, in the decree of 30 June, 1932—*A. A. S.*, XXIV (1932), 272.

sacrament must be deferred because the bishop cannot visit all parts of his diocese at frequent intervals in order to confirm. In this manner a mistaken appraisal of the relative importance of the two precepts regarding the time for receiving these two sacraments and their sequence might lead back to the wrong practice of a late First Communion, notwithstanding the fact that the Sacred Congregation of Sacraments by the decree *Quam singulari*, 8 August, 1910, had declared that the age for receiving First Holy Communion is about seven years, more or less.[5]

To forestall such a calamity the Sacred Congregation reiterates that it is more in harmony with the nature and effects of the sacrament of Confirmation that it precede First Holy Communion. Nevertheless, if Confirmation is deferred for any reason whatsoever, that is no reason for postponing First Holy Communion. Even if Confirmation is delayed, children should be admitted to First Holy Communion upon attaining the use of reason, in conformity with the decree *Quam singulari* of the Sacred Congregation of Sacraments and with canon 854. This distinction rests upon solid theological basis: there is a strict obligation to receive Holy Communion and it is binding on all who have attained the use of reason—there is no such strict obligation to receive Confirmation.[6]

Our inquirer's difficulty seems to turn about the phrase that children above the age of reason are not to be considered forbidden (" non tamen iidem censendi sunt prohiberi ") to approach the Holy Table if their confirmation is postponed. There is no difficulty in reconciling this phrase with the strict " command " of the decree *Quam singulari*, that children be admitted to Holy Communion at the age of reason. Still less does it follow that this latter precept is toned down to a mere counsel. On the contrary, the recent decree seeks to anticipate the erroneous conclusion that the precept of early Communion stands or falls with the actual conferring or delaying of Confirmation. If the latter is postponed, the decree declares that is no reason for denying children who have attained the use of reason and otherwise fulfil the conditions laid down in canon 854, approach to the Holy Table. The Sacred Congregation did not feel the necessity of inculcating anew the obligation of such children receiving Holy Communion immediately. It considered it sufficient to cut off all excuse for not carrying it out. The duty of children receiving Holy Communion at a tender age and the pastors' and parents' duty of preparing them for early reception of the Holy Eucharist are not in the least affected by the recent decree, in the event that Confirmation must be delayed for a shorter or longer time. The words " non . . . censendi sunt prohiberi " do not reduce the obligation of early First Communion to a mere counsel, but reaffirm the Church's position that delay of Confirmation does not justify anyone in hindering, preventing, forbidding such children the early reception of First Holy Communion.

---

[5] *Fontes*, n. 2103.

[6] Cf. P. Maroto, " Animadversiones ", *Apollinaris*, IV (1931), 372-377; V (1932), 266-268; A. Vermeersch, " Annotationes ", *Periodica*, XXI (1932), 276-277; A. Arndt, " In welchem Alter ist das Sakrament der Firmung zu empfangen?", *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*, LXXV (1922), 315-316; E. Springer, " Zum erlass der S. Congregatio de Sacramentis über das Alter der Firmlinge ", *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*, LXXXVI (1933), 491-498.

LOTIO VAGINALIS AGAIN.

Qu. Apropos of the answer to the question concerning " Lotio Vaginalis,' in last November's REVIEW, may I call attention to the following points:

1. St. Alphonsus and the Redemptorists do not constitute the majority of theologians.
2. If the argument from analogy is based on a probably valid opinion of Lehmkuhl, Genicot, and Vermeersch, why say that the opinion is ordinarily considered " intrinsically wrong "?
3. We agree that the husband's right has been violated; but so have the rights of the *virgo innupta et mulier innupta oppressa,* though not irreparably any more than the husband's rights in this case. The *immediate expulsion,* however, is permitted and even probably valid. It must be conceded that in 1827 this solution would have been received because the question of the time of conception was more clouded than it is to-day.
4. Why not have recourse to the words " Migratio autem spermatis est continuatio injuriae a viro commissae " (Noldin, p. 73, *De Castitate*). If the seed is the unjust aggressor against the physical persons mentioned above after the first right is violated and they are permitted to expel the same, why may not the man in this case demand the same?

Resp. 1. The text of the response does not say that St. Alphonsus and the Redemptorists constitute the majority of theologians. It reads "*probably* the majority of theologians . . . *Certainly* St. Alphonsus," etc. St. Alphonsus himself gives quite a list. Among modern theologians outside the Redemptorist school might be mentioned Merkelbach.

2. The whole point at issue *is* whether or not it is intrinsically wrong. Those who hold that, in certain circumstances, it would be permissible, have to assume that in such circumstances it would not be intrinsically wrong. This is rejected by the majority of theologians. The unlawfulness of the act arises *ex objecto* not *ex circumstantiis*. Hence it can quite logically be said that it is ordinarily considered intrinsically wrong.

3. If we assume—which I do not—that a *mulier oppressa* may expel the seed, it would not follow that the husband could force his wife who has acted against his right to do the same thing. The argument from analogy would have to be founded on either the reasons or upon the authority of the theologians adduced. It does not follow from the former, because those reasons are not cogent; nor from the latter, because that authority does not extend to the case under discussion. We can only guess what they would say about this case. There are principles even in these texts from which the exact opposite can be proved. Lehmkuhl, Genicot and Vermeersch, all say—perhaps without advertence to the case in point—that if a woman consents, she may not expel the seed. Those who hold that what can licitly be done before the seed has been deposited can be done afterward, involve themselves in a contradiction. They should logically make the same concession to the woman who repents of her act immediately afterward.

4. The seed itself is certainly not an unjust aggressor. It is incapable of a human act and hence of any injustice. The words of Noldin, "Migratio autem spermatis," etc., do not prove anything. Conception, pregnancy and birth are also "continuatio injuriae a viro commissae". On that same principle abortion would not always be intrinsically wrong. The opponents probably would object: The good effect intended would in that case be far inferior to the evil permitted; hence no cause would justify it. I answer: I can conceive of a case in which the *bonum* and *malum* would balance: for instance, suppose a mother's life were imperilled by the presence of an unjustly acquired fetus.

"USUAL CONDITIONS" FOR GAINING A PLENARY INDULGENCE.

Qu. In the booklet, *Pray For Us*, by the late Monsignor John J. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D. (New York: Kenedy & Sons) there is a summary (p. x) of:

> Special conditions usually required for plenary, and at times for partial indulgences: 1. confession; 2. communion; 3. visit to a church or public chapel or oratory; 4. prayer according to and including the intention of the Holy Father.

In the Breviary, at the "En ego" there is the note: "Indulg. plenaria recitantibus post Missam. Pius PP. IX, 31 Julii 1858." You will notice that, as regards this prayer, no visit or prayer for the intention of the Holy Father is prescribed.

(a) But to keep it in conformity with Fr. Burke's Nos. 3 and 4, perhaps these requirements are implied.

(b) Or may it be that there are some plenary indulgences which do not require a visit and the prayers for the Pope's intention?

(c) Suppose the prayer "En ego" requires a visit and prayer for the Pope's intention, must the visit and prayer be made at a time subsequent to the recitation of that prayer?

Resp. What is to be understood by the phrase "usual conditions" for gaining certain, perhaps most, plenary indulgences has never been directly declared by any of the Sacred Congregations or Tribunals of the Roman Curia which in the course of time have enjoyed jurisdiction in matters of indulgences.

Recently the Sacred Penitentiary published an authentic and exclusive collection of all prayers and pious works which have been enriched with indulgences for the benefit of all the faithful from 1899 to 1928 inclusive.[1] In the "Praenotanda" it is stated: "4. Conditiones, quae pro acquirendis plenariis Indulgentiis, in hac collectione contentis, ordinario praescribuntur, quaeque per notam clausulam "suetis conditionibus" designantur, sunt: Confessio, Communio, visitatio ecclesiae vel publici oratorii et oratio ad mentem Summi Pontificis. In casibus vero, in quibus omnes recensitae conditiones non requiruntur, eae, quae necessariae sunt, singulatim in propriis locis adnotantur." [2]

---

[1] *Collectio Precum Piorumque Operum quibus Romani Pontifices in favorem Omnium Christifidelium aut Quorumdam Coetuum Personarum Indulgentias adnexuerunt ab anno 1899 ad 1928*, (Romae: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1929). This has been published in English under the title *Collection of Prayers and Good Works* . . . tr. . . . by the Rev. Richard E. Power . . . under authority from the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary, (New York: Benziger Bros., 1931).

From this it is evident that the four conditions which the late Monsignor Burke enumerated as usually required for gaining plenary indulgences are exactly what he states. It must, however, be noted that, as the above quotation from the "Praenotanda" in the *Collectio Precum* clearly intimates, those four conditions are *usually but not always* prescribed. It is therefore necessary to take note of whether all or only some and, if so, which of the four conditions are prescribed for any particular plenary indulgence.

What has been said answers the second of the questions submitted by our inquirer.

As regards the third, it does not matter in what sequence the conditions are fulfilled. For example, the prescribed visit to a church may be made before or after the other conditions.[3] And the Code expressly permits that confession may be made the week before as well as the week after a day on which certain visits, etc., must be made, and also that Communion may be received on the vigil of the feast or any day during the octave.[4]

To apply these provisions to the prayer "En ego, o bone et dulcissime Jesu": the conditions for gaining this indulgence are enunciated in a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences thus: ". . . qui *vere poenitentes, confessi, sacraque Communione refecti,* dictamque Orationem *En ego etc.* quocumque idiomate, dummodo versio sit fidelis, ante quamcumque Sanctissimi Crucifixi imaginem *devote recitaverint,* ac insuper *per aliquod temporis spatium juxta mentem Sanctitatis Suae pie oraverint.*" [5]

Here the several prescribed works are individually enumerated: Confession, Communion, the recitation of the prayer

---

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. X. The same rule was mentioned in *The Raccolta* or Collection of Indulgenced Prayers and Good Works, (10 ed., New York: Benziger Bros., 1908), p. X. Cf. Beringer, *Die Ablässe,* (15 ed., Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1921), I, n. 99, 168.

[3] S. C. Indulg., 19 May, 1759—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 214. Cf. Beringer, *Die Ablässe*, I, n. 93.

[4] Canon 931 § 1. Cf. W. Crosam, "Siehe, o mein geliebter" und "gutiger Jesus usw." und die Gewinnung des damit verbundenen vollkommenen Ablässes'", *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift,* LXXIII (1920), 154-155.

[5] 31 July, 1858—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 386.

"En ego",[6] and a further prayer for the intention of the Pope. But there is no mention of a visit to a church or public oratory and none is required. While most persons, usually at their very great convenience, will recite this prayer and the other for the intention of the Pope in church, it is not at all necessary to recite them there. This may be a great convenience, e. g., for a priest who says Mass in a semi-public or private oratory.

Unfortunately even the supplement to the Roman Breviary,[7] referred to by our inquirer, fails in just that regard which is criticized above, when it prefixes to the prayer "En ego" the bare statement: "Oratio ad D. N. J. C. Crucifixum—Indulg. plenaria recitantibus post Missam—Pius PP. IX, 31 Julii 1858." (1) It does not mention the necessity of confession;[8] (2) it is inexact in saying: "post Missam", as this might mean "after *hearing* Mass" without communicating and does not indicate that the indulgence can be gained by all receiving Holy Communion; (3) it does not state that the prayer must be recited before an image of the Crucified Saviour (though it actually prints such a picture); (4) it does not mention the necessity of another prayer[9] for the Pope's intention.

In the 1936 edition of Pustet's *Breviarium Romanum*, at page (16), the note prefixed to this prayer reads: "Oratio ad D. N. I. C. Crucifixum. Indulgentia plenaria recitantibus post Missam et orantibus ad mentem Summi Pontificis. Pius PP. IX, 31 Julii 1858.—Indulgentia 10 annorum toties quoties. Pius PP. XI, 19 Januarii 1934." Thus the first part of this note approaches more nearly the conditions required for gaining the plenary indulgence, though it does not explicitly mention the necessity of reciting this prayer *before an image of the Crucified*

---

[6] "1°. Utrum scilicet preces ad lucrandas indulgentias sive plenarias sive partiales, sint recitandae flexis genibus?" To this query the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences answered, 18 September, 1862: "Negative, nisi aliter praescriptum sit in documento concessionis."—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 398. Although it is not explicitly prescribed in the decree of 31 July, 1858, quoted above, nevertheless it seems necessary, because the prayer itself calls for it: ". . . ante conspectum tuum genibus me provolo. . . ." Cf. Beringer, *Die Ablässe*, I, n. 134. A different conclusion is reached by M. J. Fallon, "Conditions required for the gaining of the Plenary Indulgence attached to the Prayer 'En ego'", *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, V. Series, vol. XLI (1933), 94-95.

[7] Pustet's edition, Brev. 5 (1925), pars autumnalis, p. (17).

[8] With due regard for canon 931 § 3.

[9] E. g., one Our Father, Hail Mary and Glory. Cf. S. Poenitentiaria Ap., declaration, 20 September, 1933—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis* XXV (1933), 446.

Saviour, nor does it state that it can be gained *after Communion*. Although this plenary indulgence can be gained only once a day, even by priests who binate,[10] the second part of the note just mentioned refers to the more recent concession of a partial indulgence of ten years which can be gained as often as the prescribed prayers are recited.[11]

This illustrates very well how necessary it is to keep in mind every one of the prescribed works. It is incumbent especially upon those who would bring any indulgence to the knowledge of the faithful, to be very exact in enumerating all the conditions required for any particular indulgence, whether plenary or partial; and the *censor librorum* should carefully look up the reference and see that the conditions are given correctly.

ANOTHER CRUCIFIX WITH "TOTIES QUOTIES" INDULGENCE.

Qu. Apropos of a recent article in the REVIEW on the subject of crucifixes to which is attached the "Toties Quoties" indulgence, may I bring to your attention the following point. It is suggested by the summary of the indulgences which were recently granted by the Holy Father to those who make the Stations of the Cross. In the enumeration of these indulgences, one reads the following, which may explain the indulgences attached to crucifixes:

> These indulgences may be gained by those also who observe the conditions required for making the Way of the Cross without visiting the stations, but by holding in their hands a crucifix especially blessed to the effect (decrees of 8 August, 16 September, 1859, and 25 March, 1931); in such a way, however, that anyone who, for any reasonable cause, cannot recite all the Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys prescribed, shall gain, instead of the plenary indulgence, a partial indulgence of ten years and ten quarantines for each Our Father, Hail Mary and Glory he recites. Nevertheless, those who, because of the gravity of their illness, can only kiss or even only gaze upon their crucifix, without making an ejaculatory prayer, are not excluded from gaining the plenary indulgence.

---

[10] S. C. Indulg., 20 June 1892—*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXIV, 744, which refers to a decree of the same Congregation of 7 March 1678—*Decreta Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 18. Cf. canon 928.

[11] S. Poenitentiaria Ap., 2 February 1934—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXVI (1934), 108.

It would seem, then, that those who are in this last-named condition, can gain a plenary indulgence and a second plenary indulgence if they have received Holy Communion on the same day, every time they kiss or only gaze upon their crucifix blessed especially for the gaining of the indulgences of the Way of the Cross. There is no limit set to the number of times a person may make the Stations of the Cross on the same day, and this holds good for the crucifix which is used for the Way of the Cross.

It follows that for a gravely sick person, his specially blessed crucifix is a crucifix with the " toties quoties " indulgence.

Full compliance with the conditions laid own is necessary for the gaining of any indulgence.

Resp. As our correspondent intimates, it is possible that the card which was discussed in the November issue of the REVIEW, and copy of which is reprinted at the end of this Conference, refers to the crucifix enriched with the indulgence of the Way of the Cross.[1] But even this may be doubted, for under n. 2 the card mentions the indulgence of the Way of the Cross with which the crucifix is enriched, though under that n. 2 it mentions only the more usual condition of reciting twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys.

Granted, however, that, after n. 3 recites the Apostolic Indulgences, n. 4 returns to the indulgences of the Way of the Cross, this number is not exact.

Clement XIV, on 26 January, 1773, had extended the indulgences of the Way of the Cross to the sick and others legitimately hindered from making the Stations, provided they held a crucifix blessed for this purpose and recited nineteen (twenty) Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys. This was confirmed by decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Sacred Relics, 16 September, 1859.[2] In favor of the sick who could not recite the twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys, the Minister General of the Friars Minor had obtained a commutation which Leo XIII had fixed at an oral recitation of an act of contrition and of the verse, " Te ergo quaesmus tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso sanguine redemisti," and at least the mental following of the recitation by another of three Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys.[3] This requirement was further reduced by decree of the Sacred Penitentiary of 25 March, 1931, so that sick persons who could neither make the Way of the Cross nor recite the prescribed twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys, " without grave inconvenience or difficulty," could gain all the indulgences of the Stations of the Cross " either by kissing or only gazing upon a crucifix, blessed for this purpose and shown to them by a priest or any other person, in love and contrition, and by reciting a short prayer or an ejaculation in memory of the Passion and Death of our Lord Jesus Christ." [4]

---

[1] The faculty to bless crucifixes and to attach the indulgences of the Way of the Cross is granted, in the Order of Friars Minor, to the Minister General, the Ministers Provincial, the local superiors and their vicars as also by those priests of the Order whom the Minister General delegates. Cf. M. Sleutjes, *Instructio de Stationibus S. Viae Crucis necnon Crucifixis Viae Crucis,* (5 ed., Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1927), n. 69. Cardinals enjoy the same faculty in virtue of canon 239 § 1 n. 1, and bishops in virtue of canon 349 § 1 n. 1, without the power of delegating others. Priests who are not members of the Order of Friars Minor can obtain this faculty only from the Sacred Penitentiary. Cf. S. Poenitentiaria, decr. " Consilium suum ", 20 March, 1933—*Acta Ap. Sedis,* XXV (1933), 170-171.

[2] *Acta Ap Sedis,* XXIII (1931), 522, footnote 1.

The decree of the Sacred Penitentiary of 20 October, 1931, which is quoted by our correspondent and which determines the indulgences for the Way of the Cross and the conditions for gaining them, renews the extension of these indulgences in favor of those who cannot make the Way of the Cross itself but who use a Crucifix blessed for this purpose: so, however, that (1) by the recitation of twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys as prescribed since Clement XIV, they gain the plenary indulgence; (b) if for any good reason they cannot recite all twenty Our Fathers, etc., they gain a partial indulgence of ten years and ten quarantines for each Our Father, Hail Mary and Glory recited; (c) but those who are so ill that they can do no more than kiss or even only gaze upon a crucifix enriched with the indulgences of the Way of the Cross gain the plenary indulgence, even if they cannot recite any ejaculatory prayer.[5] This is the latest and most generous reduction of the conditions for gaining the indulgence of the Way of the Cross in favor of the sick.

---

[3] . . . ut eorum loco ad acquirendas indulgentias Viae Crucis, ipsi ore recitent Actum Contritionis, et invocationem 'Te ergo quaesumus tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso sanguine redemisti' et mente saltem sequantur recitationem ab alio adstante factam trium Pater, Ave, Gloria."—Leo XIII, brief *Exponi Nobis*, 9 September, 1890—*Acta Minorum*, IX (1890), 148-149.

[4] . . . Pius Pp. XI . . . benigne concedere dignatus est ut infirmi qui pium exercitium Viae Crucis nec in forma ordinaria nec . . . per recitationem scilicet viginti *Pater*, *Ave* et *Gloria*, absque gravi incommodo vel difficultate peragere valeant, omnes et singulas indulgentias eidem pio exercitio quomodocumque adnexas, lucrari possint vel osculando vel etiam tantum intuendo, cum affectu et animo contrito, in aliquem Crucifixum ad hoc benedictum, eis vel a sacerdote vel ab aliqua alia persona exhibitum, et recitando brevem aliquam orationem vel precem iaculatoriam in memoriam Passionis et mortis Iesu Christi Domini Nostri. S. Poenitentiaria Ap., decree, *Devotam Passionis*, 25 March, 1931—*Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII (1931), 167. Perhaps those who distributed the cards in question meant to quote the conditions laid down in this decree. If this was intended, the conditions were not correctly stated: (a) the grave inconvenience and difficulty of which the decree speaks is much more than ordinary illness; (b) the prayer suggested on the card might meet the requirements of an act of love and contrition: but the respective clause in the decree does not require an explicit act of love and contrition, but merely the state of grace. Cf. S. C. Indulg., 17 December, 1870—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 427. (c) The prayer mentioned does not contain a memento of the Passion and Death of our Lord as prescribed by the decree. Moreover at this date the decree is superseded by the later one quoted by our correspondent.

But the words " si quis, vi morbi, vel tantum osculari vel intueri tantum queat in Crucifixum ad hoc benedictum " demand something more grievous than that which is implied by the card. It is true, this most generous concession is not restricted to those who are dangerously ill; but in order that they may benefit by it, their illness must be so severe that they cannot without grave inconvenience or difficulty recite twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys.

It is evident therefore that, if the card submitted by our original inquirer intends in n. 4 to enumerate the conditions under which those who are very ill can gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross, it adds a prayer that, if it is to be understood of the memento of the Passion and Death of our Saviour, is at least not always required. What is more, it makes this latest concession embrace many cases of those who are not suffering quite severely. These cases are not at all contemplated in the last clause of the decree just quoted. The concession is manifestly granted only to those who are suffering so severely that they find it morally impossible to recite twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorys. They and they only can gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross by merely kissing or gazing upon the blessed crucifix, if they cannot add even an ejaculatory memento of the Passion and Death of our Saviour.

---

[5] . . . et si quis, vi morbi, vel tantum osculari vel intueri tantum queat in Crucifixum ad hoc benedictum, non vero addere precem iaculatoriam, indulgentiam plenariam consequi non impediatur."—S. Poenitentiaria Ap. decree *Pium Viae Crucis,* 20 October, 1931—*Acta Ap. Sedis,* XXIII (1931), 523.

Reprint of the reverse of the card to which reference is made in the first paragraph (p. 170) of this answer follows:

An Indulgenced Crucifix

With Very Special Indulgences for the Sick.

The Indulgences Attached to this Crucifix:

1. Indulgence at the hour of death.
2. Indulgences of the Way of the Cross (for those who, unable to make the Way of the Cross in church, hold it in the hand and, thinking of the Passion, devoutly say 20 Our Fathers, Hail Marys, and Glorys).
3. Apostolic Indulgences.
4. Plenary Indulgence *for the sick, as often as* they devoutly kiss the crucifix and also make (even if only with the mind or with the heart) an act of love *and* an act of sorrow; applicable also to the faithful departed. (Example of act of love and sorrow: "*My God, I love Thee: and because I love Thee I am sorry for all my sins.*")

N. B.—This last mentioned Plenary Indulgence can be gained as often as the conditions mentioned are fulfilled. *The sick* is to be taken in the ordinary meaning of the word. It is not necessary that the sickness be dangerous or that one be confined to bed or has to lie down. The extraordinary faculty to enrich crucifixes with this precious indulgence was granted by Pope Pius XI to a Roman Monsignor residing in the Motherhouse of the Society of the Divine Savior in Rome.

Through the devout use of this crucifix in the way mentioned above, the sick, by applying the Plenary Indulgences thus gained to the souls in purgatory, can exercise a great apostolate of mercy in favor of the holy souls and mightily promote the greater glory of God. These Plenary Indulgences can, of course, also be gained for oneself.

When you desire to gain them for the poor souls, or some particular soul or souls, *make your intention accordingly.*

The Society of the Divine Savior

St. Nazianz, Wisconsin

EXEMPTION FROM ABSTINENCE BECAUSE OF AGE.

Qu. Does an exemption from the law of fast for a person over 60 years of age imply an exemption, or at least a dispensation, from abstinence during Lent (excluding Fridays)? A man of 60 is classed with persons engaged in laborious occupation. Later, workingmen and their families are dispensed from abstinence during Lent, etc. Now those engaged in laborious occupations are much more entitled to the above dispensation than are mere workingmen as such.

Secondly, may it not be that the very abstinence in Lent on Wednesdays, etc. is because of the fast of Lent itself, since every day during Lent is a fast day and only Wednesdays are abstinence days during, and because of, Lent itself. Would exemption from the fast of Lent include implicitly exemption from abstinence.

May I, as a pastor, dispense myself from abstinence on those days on which workingmen are dispensed since my health is far from being up to the par of a man over 70? What about Fridays, also, if suitable food cannot be obtained otherwise, and there is no danger of scandal?

Resp. A man of 70 years is not exempt or dispensed from the law of abstinence on days when the workingman's indult obtains, unless of course he is a workingman or there exists some excusing cause for dispensation. It is not so much a question of possibility as a question of fact. The Church could undoubtedly grant a dispensation in such cases. The fact however is that she has not done so by any general indult.

By the fact that a person having attained the age of 60 years is exempt from the law of fast, he is not thereby excused or dispensed from the law of abstinence.

If the inquirer means that those over 70, because they are classed with those engaged in laborious occupations, should come under the workingman's indult whether they are actually working or not, the answer is no. They are not as a matter of fact so classified. Age exempts. Hard work sometimes excuses. There is a big difference.

Even granting that the law of abstinence during Lent is a kind of *accessorium* to the law of fast, a dispensation from the law of fasting would not implicitly contain a dispensation from the law of abstinence. The same thing would apply to exempting causes. They are distinct laws. A much graver cause would be required for a dispensation from abstinence than from fast.

Since the power of dispensing is an exercise of voluntary jurisdiction, the pastor may make use of it in his own behalf (canon 201, § 3. Cf. Noldin, *Theol. Mor.*, Vol. I, p. 187). Since his authority here is limited to single cases (can. 1245), he could not give himself a general dispensation so that he would never have to abstain, but could do it only in each individual instance. He would have to verify the cause each time. The cause is required for validity. It is a rather dangerous procedure, for one is naturally inclined to magnify causes and difficulties when oneself is involved. A pastor should not be more anxious to dispense himself than to dispense his parishioners.

AUTHORIZATION TO ERECT STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

Qu. The Stations of the Cross require for validity the authorization of the parish priest. Is this required when the curate erects them? When the parish priest does so himself?

Resp. The parish priest will naturally be the one who petitions the bishop to secure the faculty of erecting the Way of the Cross. In any case, he must consent to the erection, and this consent must be expressed in writing, according to the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, 26 September, 1892, ad 10; 4 August, 1748. If he petitions the bishop directly, his consent will be implied.

The bishop will secure the faculty of delegating either the pastor or another priest, from the Sacred Penitentiary, if he already does not possess this power by virtue of his faculties received from the Holy See. (Bishops, by power of canon 349 § 1 of the Code of Canon Law may erect the Way of the Cross, but by a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary, 10 November, 1926, they cannot delegate this power by virtue of this canon.)

The bishop, possessing the power to delegate, will appoint a certain priest to erect the Way of the Cross, unless the bishop himself wishes to do it. The priest so delegated, whether he be the pastor, the curate, or another, will sign the document transmitted to him by the bishop in the space provided.

Hence we must distinguish between the petition or the consent of the pastor which must be in writing, and the document of delegation transmitted by the bishop to the one who is to erect the Way of the Cross, which must be signed, not by the pastor, but by the priest who actually performs the ceremony, unless the pastor be delegated by the bishop. In that case he should sign both documents. It may be noted that this document of delegation is signed after the Stations of the Cross have been erected, by the priest delegated.

PLAYING ORGAN DURING DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNION.

Qu. Should the organ play and the singing go on while a priest is distributing Holy Communion?

Resp. " During *low* Mass, motets may be sung and the organ played, according to the rubrics, but the music must cease at times when the celebrant prays in a loud voice. Music may be heard at the following times: during the priest's preparation and thanksgiving; from the Offertory to the Preface; from the Sanctus to the Pater noster, and from the Agnus Dei to the Post-Communion. During the Communion of the people, however, the music must stop for the recitation of the Confiteor and the Ecce Agnus Dei." (Regulations for the Diocese of Rome, No. 28, 2 February, 1912.)

At High Mass, if Communion is distributed, the organ may be played, and if the choir sings, the motet or hymn must be in honor of the Blessed Sacrament and in Latin. (S.R.C. 3975, ad 5.) The vernacular may never be used in a chanted Mass. The Latin hymn or motet or verse must be approved by the Church, and no change in the words is permitted. A Roman regulation of 20 August, 1692, prescribes for this occasion the hymns of St. Thomas or antiphons from the Office or Mass in honor of the Blessed Sacrament.

If music or singing or both are desired by the priest at this time, the minds of the communicants should not be distracted by irrelevant words or sentiments. Ordinarily, silence at this serious moment will be preferred by most of the faithful. They should devote these few minutes to personal and individual prayer.

HYMN AT OFFERTORY OF THE MASS.

Qu. Should the organist wait until the chalice veil is removed at the Offertory before playing the Offertory hymn, usually the "Ave Maria ", or start right after the priest sings " Oremus "?

Resp. In the Roman rite there is no Offertory hymn. However, there is a verse or antiphon prescribed by the Roman Missal to be said by the priest at low Mass and chanted by the choir at High Mass. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, 21 September, 1884, decreed that " the omission of the Gradual, Tract, Offertory and Communion cannot be tolerated ". In his Motu Proprio of 22 November, 1903, Pope Pius X wrote: " It is permitted, after the Offertory prescribed for the Mass, has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a *brief* motet to words approved by the Church."

It should be remembered that the choir plays not only an important but an essential part in the drama of the chanted Mass. Just as the Church carefully prepares and prescribes the words used by the celebrant at the altar, so has she carefully prepared and prescribed the words used by the choir. The purpose of the choir at High Mass is not merely to sing, but to sing the Mass. Neither celebrant nor choir has any right to change, mutilate or omit any part of the divine liturgy. The Mass is not the service of an individual congregation, but the public worship of the universal Church, the Spouse of Christ, in which the actions, language and prayers are universally one.

Hence the priest will be most careful in the public worship of the Church. He will see to it, however difficult it may be, that the choir in his charge shall sing the Mass carefully and completely. After the Offertory has been chanted, the "Ave Maria " may then be " executed," if time permits.

GOSPEL FOR THE EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST.

Qu. Where can I get a good and clear explanation of the Gospel read on the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost?

Resp. Consult " Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals ", by Dr. Ryan, Browne & Nolan, Dublin, Vol. 2, pp. 228 seq. The text of the gospel is given in Greek, Latin and English, and each verse is explained with notes. We do not wish to imply that this particular work is the best, or that it be used in preference to others, but we think it may be obtained from local booksellers, or found in many clerical libraries.

WEARING COPE AT FUNERAL SERMON.

Qu. After giving absolution over the casket must the priest take off the cope to preach?

Resp. Liturgical authors confine their remarks on funeral sermons to the occasions when a priest other than the celebrant is the preacher, since it seems to be the mind of the Church that a funeral oration is delivered only at the burial of a prominent churchman or layman, when, naturally, a number of priests are in attendance. In *Matters Liturgical*, we read: " With regard to the funeral sermon, the rules for sacred preaching handed down by the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory, 28 June, 1917, to the Ordinaries, establish the following: ' No one shall have the right to deliver a funeral sermon, or oration, without the previous and express permission of the Ordinary; and the Ordinary may require that the manuscript be shown him.' (*A. A. S.*, Vol. IX, p. 328.) The funeral sermon, if there be one, shall be preached *before* the Absolution, without surplice or stole. (S.R.C. 2888.) If the preacher be a religious, in the habit of his Order." When the preacher is also the celebrant, he should try to conform to these rules as closely as possible. In any case, the cope should not be worn, as the sermon will be delivered after the priest takes off his chasuble at the close of the Mass, and before he puts on the cope.

INTERPRETING INTENTION OF GIVER OF MASS STIPEND.

Qu. Please, permit me to submit two old, but, as far as I know, still puzzling questions.

1. Mr. C. bequeathes to Father A. the sum of five hundred dollars for Masses without any further qualification or restriction. May Father A., instead of saying 500 Low Masses, offer the number of Missae Cantatae required by the customary stipend?

Answering a similar question the Review (May, 1900, p. 536) states that, as the testator has not signified his intention specifically, it is to be interpreted " ex communiter contingentibus; " that his intention is, therefore, presumed to desire " Missae Privatae secundum honorarium consuetum; " and that hence the obligation exists to say these.

I think this opinion is correct. Unless circumstances clearly indicate the contrary it seems sordid to substitute Missae Cantatae for Low Masses. Is there any official decision of this question.

2. B. gives Father A. fifty dollars with the instruction to say " some Masses ad intentionem ". It may possibly be presumed that the donor of the stipend intends to bestow a special benefit on Father A. and does not insist on 50 Masses; but how many Masses should be said?

Resp. 1. Besides the opinion referred to regarding the kind and number of Masses to be said in view of a large bequest for Masses, there is another which holds that (unless circumstances point to another intention of the testator) it may be presumed that he meant to have High Masses sung, especially when there are positive reasons for this conclusion. See C. F. Keller, *Mass Stipends* (Washington, 1925), pp. 89-94; ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, LXXXIV (1931), 521-522; LXXXV (1931), 525-526.

There is no decision that explicitly asserts what the above opinion holds, though there is one that lends support to it. (Cf. Keller, *ut supra.*)

2. No general appraisal can be given of the number of Masses that must be said if a donor gives a stipend of fifty dollars asking a priest to say some Masses according to his intention. Too many circumstances must be taken into consideration to give any general answer. The priest receiving the stipend must weigh the circumstances and decide as they warrant.

IS MANIPLE WORN WHEN MAKING SUNDAY ANNOUNCEMENTS?

Qu. In making Sunday announcements and five or ten minute talks, should the maniple be worn?

Resp. In a Solemn Mass, if the celebrant, who is also the preacher, leaves the altar and goes to the pulpit, he takes off chasuble and maniple. As announcements and short talks on Sundays can hardly come under the classification of a formal sermon, it does not seem necessary to remove the maniple, or chasuble, unless the pulpit is a great distance from the altar.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT THEOLOGY.

Some familiarity with the historical aspects of the doctrines of the faith is necessary for a thorough understanding of Catholic theology. One of the most outstanding contributions to this phase of sacred science in recent months is a lengthy article on the revival of sins, by Dr. A. Landgraf in *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* 1937 IV. In discussing the doctrine of the revival of merits, theologians sometimes propose the question whether sins once forgiven return to the soul in the event of a relapse into mortal sin. Nowadays, the reply is an unqualified negation. However, so briefly is the matter discussed that the student is liable to believe that theologians always unanimously taught the non-revival of sins. The truth is that for a time, in the middle ages, it was more commonly taught that sins previously forgiven do return in some manner if the pardoned sinner again falls grievously. A detailed account of the opinions proposed on this subject by the scholastics of the twelfth and early thirteenth century forms Dr. Landgraf's thesis. The value of his article is greatly enhanced by his copious references to many medieval commentaries that are still only in manuscript form.

Those who upheld the doctrine that sins revive sought confirmation of their opinion in the scriptural parable of the servant on whom, because of his unmercifulness, his master imposed the obligation of paying debts which had previously been condoned (Mt. 18:23-35). Abelard and his school in the first half of the twelfth century were largely responsible for the interpretation of this parable in the sense that sins already pardoned revive with a new lapse into sin. However, there was a wide diversity of opinions as to the precise significance of this revival. Abelard understood it of the punishment, not the guilt, of the previous sins. Others, like Hugh of St. Victor, believed that both guilt and punishment revive. Some held that only by the commission of certain types of sin does one merit to be burdened again with his former sins. Gilbert of Porée specified the sin of apostasy and the grave violation of fraternal charity. Others included in the same category the relapse into the same kind of sin that had previously been pardoned. A milder interpretation was that the revival consists only in an increased inclination to sin due to the relapse. Peter Lombard in his writings expounded the theories both for and against the revival of sins, but refrained from deciding in favor of either. In his lectures, however, he seems to have defended the doctrine of the revival. Indeed, toward the end of the twelfth century this view was most common among the scholastics. But in the course of the thirteenth century it lost ground, and gradually yielded to the opinion that there is no revival of sins once forgiven except in the sense that ingratitude for the previous pardon is an aggravating circumstance of a relapse into sin, and accordingly the relapsed sinner may be said, in a broad sense, to have returned to the state in which he was before receiving pardon. This marked a return to the teaching of St. Augustine on this subject, as it seems, although some statements of the Saint in *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*,[1] might lead one to believe that he too favored the more severe opinion.

Another eminent contribution to the history of Dogma is *Les Mystères; L'Orphisme*[2] by the venerable scholar, Père M. Lagrange, O.P. This work is intended to refute the charge that primitive Christianity drew its doctrines and cult in great measure from the pagan mystery religion known as Orphism. The author presents a very complete picture of this religion, which was a combination of a Thracian and a Cretan cult. He proves conclusively that Orphism did not constitute the source of those Christian doctrines, such as the Holy Eucharist, the redemptive work of Christ, and original sin, that bear a superficial resemblance to certain tenets of the pagan religion.

Writing on "The Neo-Platonist Attack on Christianity" in the *Dublin Review* for July, A. H. Armstrong draws an interesting parallelism between the pagan philosophy prevailing in the early Christian centuries—especially as it was expounded by Porphyry and the Emperor Julian—and the Modernistic views current at the present day. Though differing in accidentals (such as their attitude toward magic) the two systems are substantially identical. For the fundamental principles of both are the same—the denial of the necessity of supernatural revelation, opposition to the doctrines of sin and grace, the conviction that man by his own innate natural powers can attain to God. The revival of Neo-Platonism, Dr. Armstrong concludes, is the inspiration of most of the attacks on Christian and Catholic orthodoxy at the present time.

---

[1] Migne, P. L., 43, 119.

[2] Paris, Libraire Lecoffre.

That a book written by a saint should be relegated to the Index seems the height of incongruity. Yet, until 1890 this catalogue of proscribed literature listed a work entitled *De Fiducia et Misericordia Dei,* with its author given as John Fisher, bishop of Rochester; although the saving qualification was added " which however is falsely attributed to him ". In the *Clergy Review* for July Monsignor P. E. Hallett discusses the authorship of this book. He admits that it might have been written by St. John Fisher, for there is nothing in it that cannot be understood in a Catholic sense, although the emphasis on the need of faith for justification is Lutheran in tone. The main objection is the omission of any reference to essentially Catholic features of justification, such as the confession of sins, works of penance, indulgences, the satisfactory efficacy of the Mass. Monsignor Hallett is himself confident that the book was not written by the Saint, and stresses its various points of divergence from the known writings of the martyred bishop. Moreover, there are reasons for believing that the author was a certain Georgius Cassander, a Flemish theologian anxious to effect a reconciliation between the doctrines of the reformers and the teachings of Catholicism.

As an excellent contribution to apologetic theology the article entitled " Un Essai de Synthèse Apologétique " by the Rev. J. Coppens in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* 1937 III, deserves recognition. Father Coppens proposes a line of argumentation leading to the Catholic Church, which is an ingenious combination of external and internal criteria. In brief, he shows that the particular needs and aspirations of mankind, beginning with the people of Israel and coming down to the present day, have been perfectly satisfied by the continuous chain of the Mosaic religion, the revelations of Christ and the Catholic Church. The logical inference is that this chain represents the supernatural communications of the Almighty to the human race. It is interesting to note that Father Coppens regards the individual details in his line of argumentation as furnishing only probability, but believes that their convergence and harmony afford a proof that is morally certain. Thus, he is adopting the terminology of Cardinal Newman in his *Grammer of Assent.* Apropos of this usage, an article by the Rev. H. Tristram, an Oratorian Father, in *Gregorianum,* 1937 II-III, presenting some Latin writings of Newman on faith, heretofore unpublished, will be of assistance to any one who would attempt to understand the Cardinal's ideas on the process and the preambles of the act of divine faith.

In the same issue of the *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* Canon Bittremieux discusses the clause in the Oath against Modernism which declares that God's existence can be proved by the natural light of reason from the visible works of creation, as a cause from its effects. These words were intended by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius X, as a repetition of a solemn definition of the Vatican Council.[3] It is to be noted however, that the Oath uses the word *demonstrari,* whereas the Council employed the phrase *certo cognosci.* Moreover, the words *tamquam causam per effectus* in the Oath are additional. Canon Bittremieux believes that in promulgating the Oath the Pope did not speak *ex cathedra.* At the same time, he contends, *demonstrari* expresses a matter of divine-catholic faith, taught implicitly by the Vatican Council, and the same degree of assent must be given to the words *tamquam causam per effectus* because the ordinary and universal magisterium of the Church teaches as a revealed doctrine that God's existence can be proved from the works of creation as a cause from its effects.

Writing on "Lourdes and Psycho-Therapy" in *The Month* for August, R.J. Dingle points out that all theories which place the sources of the cures wrought at Lourdes in auto-suggestion are wholly untenable, since the conditions for such a mode of healing are entirely absent at this celebrated shrine. His final judgment of this naturalistic explanation is: "It is an amateur's theory, advanced to escape the necessity of admitting the miraculous".

Dr. A. Vallet, for many years president of the Bureau des Constatations Médicales at Lourdes has published in book form a series of lectures under the title *Mes Conférences sur les Guér-*

---

[3] Denzinger, n. 1806.

isons Miraculeuses de Lourdes (Paris, Téqui). It is technical rather than popular, being intended principally for medical men. To show the care that is exercised before a cure is pronounced miraculous, Dr. Villet describes in detail a remarkable case of the restoration of a person to health, which however was not accepted by the Bureau as a miracle.

Another work bearing on apparently supernatural phenomena is *Où en est actuellement l'Affaire de Konnersreuth?* [4] by Doctor Joseph Deutsch. The author contends that the extraordinary manifestations surrounding the German woman, Theresa Neumann, have not yet been sufficiently investigated by scientific methods to be classified as undoubtedly supernatural. He points out that Theresa refuses to comply with the suggestion of the Bavarian hierarchy, that she be segregated for a time from her family and home surroundings, and be subjected to a rigorous observation. Until the nature of the occurrences has been established in this manner, he asserts, there is possibility of hysteria, auto-suggestion, or even conscious or unconscious fraud.[4a]

The Catholic doctrine on the right of parents to educate their children forms the subject of an article by the Rev. M. Barbera, S.J., in *Civilità Cattolica* for September 4, 1937. It is intended as a refutation of the charge made by the German Nazis that the Church extols the rights of parents in the matter of education merely as a screen, to conceal her own efforts to secure absolute power over the young. Father Barbera shows that the Church has ever been consistent in upholding the principle that the parents have the first natural right, even when it was to the Church's own disadvantage, as when the ecclesiastical authorities stood for the unlawfulness of baptizing the children of infidels against the will of their parents.

Some excellent articles on the constituents of the supernatural life—grace and the virtues—have appeared recently. The *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for September contains an article by the Rev. John McCarthy, D.D., under the heading " The Supernatural Order ". The writer explains what is meant by the supernatural order, and then describes each of the elements that enter into this order—sanctifying grace, the infused virtues, actual grace, salutary acts, merit. After discussing the mooted question as to the manner in which charity must influence an act in order to render it meritorious, Dr. McCarthy favors the view that the presence of habitual charity in the soul suffices, provided the act proceeds from some supernatural motive. It would have been well had the writer brought out the point that the supernatural exceeds not only the *actual* created order of material and spiritual beings, but also (very probably) the nature and innate demands of even every *possible* created substance.

---

[4] Paris, Lethielleux.

[4a] According to the *London Tablet* for 25 December, Theresa herself is willing to undergo an examination, but her father refuses to allow it. This is stated by the Bishop of Regensburg.

De Fide [5] a collection of scholastic lectures by the Rev. P. Lumbreras, O.P., treats the virtue of faith as it is expounded by St. Thomas. The author departs from the view generally accepted at the present day when he holds that explicit faith in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation is required as a necessary means for salvation.

" La Grace et les Vertus Théologales " by the Rev. E. Meersch, S.J., in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for September-October, describes the sublime changes wrought in human nature by the infused habits—the divinization of man's very being and activities.

Quite appropriate to the present-day interest in social justice is an article contributed to *Angelicum* for July by the Rev. H. Hering, O.P., on the teaching of St. Thomas concerning the nature of legal justice. In most theological manuals justice is proposed as a particular cardinal virtue, divided into three species—commutative, distributive and legal. This presentation, Father Hering claims, does not square with the ideas of St. Thomas and of Aristotle. According to their teachings, justice is first divided into particular and general. The former is the cardinal virtue, and is subdivided into commutative and distributive justice. The latter—which is legal justice—enters into the practice of every particular virtue in as far as it has some bearing on the common good. Thus, the soldier who is valiant in the defence of his country exercises fortitude by his bravery, and legal justice by conferring benefits on the nation. On the other hand, every act in opposition to the common good is a violation of this legal, or general, justice, although specifically it is a sin against the particular virtue that is transgressed. As St. Thomas expresses it: "Just as charity can be called a general virtue in as far as it ordains the acts of all the virtues to the divine good, so legal justice can be called a general virtue in as far as it ordains the acts of all the virtues to the common good." [6] The ideas so lucidly presented by Father Hering are well calculated to foster the noble virtue of justice, which has so important a bearing on the progress and the amelioration of human society.

---

[5] Angelicum, Rome.

Le Dogme de la Rédemption chez Saint Thomas [7] by the Rev. A. Hardy begins with the exposition of the doctrine of the Redemption according to St. Anselm. The author then develops the same doctrine as it is found in the works of St. Thomas, and contrasts the teachings of the two saints. St. Anselm placed the efficacy of Christ's redemptive work in the expiatory value of His sufferings, offered to His Father in satisfaction for the infinite insult given by sin. To this legalistic concept St. Thomas added the important idea that the sufferings of Christ were inspired by charity. The infinite satisfaction rendered by the Word Incarnate in His Passion did indeed suffice to placate the divine justice. But the Redemption was also intended to re-unite the souls of men with God; and for this charity too was necessary. Hence, in the system of St. Thomas not the sufferings of our Saviour alone constituted the redemptive work, but His sufferings joined with charity.

De Passione et Morte Jesu Christi [8] by the Rev. J. Vosté, O.P., is a detailed exegetical and theological study of the events that transpired during the last hours of Christ's mortal life. The author differs from many Catholic scholars in holding that Judas did not leave the supper-room until after the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and that consequently he received holy communion and became a priest.

Writing on "The Proper Object of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart" in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for November, the Rev. T. Motherwey, S.J., of Mundelein, Ill., proves that the object in question is the physical heart of the Word Incarnate as the symbol of His love. That is, the two elements—the living Heart and Christ's love for mankind—constitute one object, just as body and soul constitute one human being.

---

[6] *Summa*, II-II, Q. 58, a. 6.

[7] Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.

[8] Rome, Collegio Angelico.

In the course of the nineteenth century three Jesuit professors of the Roman University—Palmieri, Tongiorgi and Franzelin—proposed views regarding the eucharistic species differing somewhat from those commonly held by Catholic theologians. Palmieri called that which affects the senses " imponderable matter ", divinely endowed with the power to produce in the senses of those present the same reactions that were produced by the substance (ponderable matter) of the bread and wine before transubstantiation took place. Tongiorgi held that after the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord nothing of these elements remain, but the power of God produces a certain " resistance " which causes in the senses the same effects that had previously been caused by the bread and wine. These views must nowadays be regarded as untenable. However, the teaching of Franzelin, which is sometimes placed in the same category with that of Tongiorgi, is defended as orthodox and tenable by the Rev. G. Filograssi, S.J., comparing the views of the three in *Gregorianum,* 1937 II-III. For, he points out, while Franzelin, like Tongiorgi, designated the eucharistic accidents as a " resistance ", he regarded this resistance as an objective reality, and not merely as a subjective phenomenon. In his view, the resistance-activity exercised by the bread and wine, is an *actio transiens*, not an *actio immanens*, which by divine power can continue to exist and operate even after the substance has passed away. Moreover, Franzelin held that this resistance is *numerically* the same as that produced by the substance of bread and wine before the consecration; whereas the other two taught that the dogma of transubstantiation is sufficiently safeguarded if only a *specific* identity is established.

In a monograph *De Natura Transsubstantiationis juxta J. Duns Scotum* [9] the Rev. H. J. Storff, O.F.M., purposes to explain the doctrine of Duns Scotus on transubstantiation, which he claims was misrepresented several years ago by the Rev. V. Cachia, O.P., in *De Natura Transsubstantiationis juxta S.*

---

[9] Florence, Collegio S. Bonaventura.

Thomam et Scotum.[10] According to Father Storff, Scotus held that the words of our Lord in instituting the Holy Eucharist of themselves prove the real presence, but not transubstantiation, the final evidence for this latter dogma being found only in the living tradition of the Church. However, he says, Scotus did not teach that the substance of the bread and wine is annihilated—a doctrine that is often attributed to the Subtle Doctor. Neither did he hold that the presence of Christ is effected by *adduction,* pure and simple, although he taught that transubstantiation can be classed as an *adductive action.*

Answering a question regarding Extreme Unction in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for December, the Rev. P. O'Neill discusses the question whether the anointing of the sick person would be valid if given with one of the two other sacred oils rather than with *oleum infirmorum,* and favors as much more probable the affirmative opinion.

A valuable addition to the rapidly growing collection of Latin works on Oriental theology is *Compendium Theologiae Orientalis* by the Rev. M. Gordillo, S.J.[11] After some general explanations on the history and the status of the dissident Oriental churches, the author discusses their theological teachings under five heads—the primacy of the Pope, the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Immaculate Conception, the sacraments, and eschatology. Then he devotes two chapters to the Nestorian and the Monophysite churches, and concludes by quoting some of the more important prescriptions of the Holy See relative to the Oriental Christians.

A briefer exposition of the same subject is Mr. Donald Attwater's article " The Faith of the Orthodox " in *The Month* for July. While endeavoring to point out the chief doctrinal differences between Orthodoxy and Catholicism, he admits that it is sometimes very difficult to determine exactly what is the official creed of the Orthodox Christians because of the lack of system and of formulation in their theological tenets. He concludes with this optimistic remark: " Time and time again it is found that alleged differences between traditional Orthodoxy and Catholicism are a matter of different emphasis or way of expression, and in fact what really separates Eastern dissidents from Rome is not so much theological dogma as the events of history and a fundamental difference of mind and temperament."

---

[10] ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Library Table, May 1930, p. 536.

[11] Rome, Oriental Institute.

In *The Month* for November Archbishop Goodier, S.J., comments on a recent work by the Orthodox scholar, Professor Bulgakov, entitled *The Wisdom of God.* The theme is that divine wisdom is the unifying principle of all the particular truths of revelation. Archbishop Goodier admits that substantially this doctrine is correct, and points out its parallelism with the teaching of some modern Catholic scholars to the effect that all the articles of faith can be centered about the doctrine of the Mystical Body.[12]

Since one of the main points of disagreement between Orthodoxy and Catholicism concerns the mode of procession of the Holy Ghost, the work of the learned Assumptionist, Père M. Jugie, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti ex Fontibus Revelationis et secundum Orientales Dissidentes*[13] supplies a real need both to Catholic and to Orthodox scholars. The author discusses the question historically and theologically, with well developed arguments both from Scripture and from Tradition for the Catholic doctrine. He asserts that the Eastern Christians of the ninth century did not correctly understand the Catholic teaching on the procession of the Holy Ghost, nor were they aware of the abundant testimony found in its support in patristic literature.

The World Conference on Faith and Orders held in Edinburgh last August has naturally raised the question as to the probability of a return of the Protestant churches to Catholic unity. Of course, there is no question of a strictly corporate reconciliation of any heretical denomination; but one might visualize a quasi-corporate reunion of a sect—that is, the simultaneous acknowledgment by a large number of its members of the truth of Catholicism, joined with the petition to be admitted into the Church. Is there any reasonable expectation of such a mass movement on the part of the members of any non-Catholic denomination in the near future? An unqualified affirmation would surely not be justified; but at the same time, some of the circumstances of the World Conference seem encouraging. Writing in *The Tablet* for 21 August, the Rev. M. Bévenot, S.J., notes that a most friendly spirit toward the Catholic Church characterized this meeting, and points out that there was a decided tendency toward Catholic doctrine both in the general Report and in the attitude of the delegates. He believes that as a result of the Conference the idea of a single Church embracing all Christendom has for the first time won the serious consideration of many who attended the meeting, and will undoubtedly be carried by them to all parts of the world.

---

[12] A timely example of this is the scholarly paper "The Mystical Body of Christ: The Synthesis of Christian Teaching" by the Rev. John McCarthy, D.D. in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for December.

[13] Rome, Roman Seminary.

The Rev. A. Bangha, S.J., of Budapest in a series of articles, translated into English and appearing in *The Tablet* for 17 and 24 July, while admitting that the probability of the return of any large number of Protestants is very slight at present, contends that nevertheless there is good hope of an extensive reunion in future. As an encouraging sign he mentions the abandonment by modern Protestants of the controversies which were waged so bitterly in the sixteenth century and an increased interest in the fundamental doctrines of the Gospels, such as salvation, grace and eternal life, which are so vital an element of Catholic dogma. Father Bangha makes the suggestion, as a helpful means of fostering a *rapprochement,* that Catholics adopt the attitude of rejoicing whenever they can find a common ground of belief with Protestants, and of meeting them, not in an aggressive manner, but with the manifest intent of examining mutual dogmatic differences in a friendly and serene atmosphere.

A perusal of *Reunion,* the quarterly published by the " Roman-minded " group of the Anglican Church, might give the impression that the return of this group, or at least of a goodly number of its members, to Catholic unity is an event that can be expected very soon. For example, the Reverend Donald Hole, under the heading " Catholic Reunion " speaks thus of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff: " It was recognized by the Council of Chalcedon that a question of doctrine could be decided by the bishop of Rome independently of the Council, and that his function in this respect was exercised in virtue of his being the successor of St. Peter. This position of the bishop of Rome was never challenged until the schism occurred between East and West, and then it was evident that the East was receding from what it had formerly held. We do not find the Vatican definitions in the first six centuries of the Christian Church, nor should we dream of looking for them, but we do find the bishop of Rome occupying an entirely unique position, accurately described by the theologians of Malines as a 'primacy, not merely of honour, but implying a duty of solicitude and activity within the universal Church for the general good in such wise that the Pope should be a centre of unity and a Head who exercises authority over the whole'. We find further that this headship and authority was accorded to him as being the successor of St. Peter, and was tacitly regarded as a part of the divine constitution of the Church".

Yet, in reply to the natural question: "Why not join the Catholic Church?", the same contributor answers: "Our refusal to take this course does not really arise from the sordid motives attributed to us by our critics, but from a genuine love and devotion for the Church of England. We love it 'arbitrarily, because it is *ours*'—the spiritual sphere in which we have been born again and nourished with the bread of life—because it has been bound up so intimately not only with our own personal experience but with every phase of our national experience".

In view of the powerful influence exerted on human nature by sentiment, this last citation throws grave doubt on the probability of any extensive Romeward movement in the near future from Anglican circles. Such too is the view of the Rev. H. Johnson, of the Oratory, writing in *The Tablet* for 11 September. "Rome and Canterbury are drawing, not nearer together, but farther apart", he asserts. One of the discouraging features, he observes, is the fact that Anglo-Catholics have remained so passive in the face of the compromising attitude taken by the Anglican episcopate in recent years toward fundamental Christian doctrines of faith and morals.

The Cambridge Summer School Lectures for 1936 have appeared in book form under the title *Man and Eternity*.[14] The general topic is the Last Things—death, the immortality of the soul, judgment, purgatory, heaven, hell. Each subject is discussed by a competent scholar. Some details worthy of note are the following: Dr. Curtin, treating of the particular judgment, believes that it is conducted by Christ in His *human* nature. Dr. Cartmell, in his lecture on the resurrection of the body, rejects the view that the identity of the risen body with that which one bore in life consists merely in the fact that the soul gives to any matter its individual characteristics, and holds that there is also identity in the material element. Father Bonnar, O.F.M., explains the difficult point of the manner in which salvation is accorded to pagans by the theory of the survival among savage races of sufficient traces of primitive revelation to enable them to make an act of faith. Father Moncrieff, O.P., proposes the question whether the souls in purgatory pray for the living, and believes that there are probabilities on both sides. Abbot Vonier, O.S.B., concludes the work with a sublime exposition of the doctrine of heaven, enlarging on the essential and the accidental blessedness of life eternal.

---

[14] London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Mount St. Alphonsus, Esopus, New York.

Book Reviews

ROME AND THE NEAPOLITAN REVOLUTION OF 1820-21. A Study in Papal Neutrality. By Joseph H. Brady, Ph.D. Columbia University Press, New York.

This volume contains an important study of the policy of neutrality as practised by the government of the States of the Church toward a state acting in accord with the principles of the liberal movement of the early nineteenth century. The task was not an easy one. An ecclesiastical state could not close its eyes to the hostility of many of the forces back of the constitutional movement to the existence of the papal government. Again, the contiguity of the Papal States and the Kingdom of Naples, as well as the situation of the former between Austrian and Neapolitan territory, gave rise to many problems. Finally, when the war began and the rival armies actually entered papal territory, the actions of the military further complicated the situation.

Dr. Brady has handled this complex situation in a masterly fashion and has succeeded in producing an interesting narrative. His study is based almost exclusively on documents contained in the Vatican archives. The Austrian and Neapolitan archives have been rightly passed over as unlikely to contain any additional light on papal policy. This presumption is justified since all the official despatches of those governments to the Vatican, and all the reports of the representatives of the Vatican near those governments are scrupulously exploited. Indeed, it would be hard to mention a more carefully documented work. In view of this it is somewhat surprising to find only one correction of errors in important published works on the subject. No doubt the author could have pointed out others had he so desired. The references to secondary Austrian sources are, however, too few. The failure to find any certain information in regard to the activities of the Carbonari is also felt, although it was inevitable.

Dr. Brady's conclusion that Cardinal Consalvi was more successful in pleasing hostile Naples than friendly Austria does not seem to be borne out by the chapters of his study on which it is based. Much of Prince Metternich's dissatisfaction was that of a man who hoped thereby to obtain greater concessions, whereas Signor Campochiaro necessarily had to do all he could to placate Rome.

Dr. Brady's volume is well printed, contains an index and a useful bibliography. It will remain authoritative in its field. In addition, because of its strictly factual nature, it provides the student of diplomacy with an excellent example of the procedure of the papal secretariate of state under Cardinal Consalvi.

THE PRIEST'S WAY TO GOD. By Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M. Patterson, N. J.: Saint Anthony's Guild Press. 1937. Pp. viii+355.

All roads lead to Rome, and to God. Each state of life, however, has its own particular way. The Roman Pontifical in its ceremonies for the conferring of the various orders serves well as a road-map for *The Priest's Way to God.*

Under this title the well-known scholar, Father Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., gives us a treat and a retreat. Handsome illustrations in line-cuts and printing in red and black give the book a missal-like format. The book has to do with the stages of a priest's preparation for his priesthood, and may therefore be called an ascetical commentary on the venerable text of the rite of ordination. Unless this learned scholar of Scripture had told us, we should not have realized the sweetness of the spiritual food in the ancient episcopal manual. *The Priest's Way to God* is a series of simple parallels between the events in the life of our Lord, the " Threefold Way " of the spiritual life and the rites in conferring Tonsure, Minor and Major Orders. As an example of the freshness of the author's style we find many such passages as this: " In his life the weekly confessions can and should be made a clearing-house, as it were, for all his spiritual efforts; the central office for the business of sanctification, where accounts are kept, where documents of good management are on exhibition, where meetings are held with the chief adviser of the firm, where plans are laid for profitable administration for the ensuing week." As might be expected from such an eminent student of the Bible, the work teems with apposite Scriptural texts. The Saint Anthony's Guild Press sustains its reputation for excellent typographical productions. *The Priest's Way* is likely to find its way into the ascetical library of every priestly priest.

LEXIKON FUER THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE. 2. Neubearbeitete Auflage des Kirchlichen Handlexikons. In Verbindung mit Fachgelehrten und mit Dr. Konrad Hofmann als Schriftleiter herausgegeben von Dr. Michael Buchberger, Bischof von Regensburg. IX Band. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder.

The ninth volume of the *Lexikon* runs from " Rufina " to " Terz," it contains 1056 columns, 12 plates, 12 charts, and 134 illustrations. The volume, like its predecessors, is such a rich mine of information that it is difficult to make a selection of topics for discussion. Perhaps the most outstanding article is that on Scholasticism by M. Grabmann, the great authority on Scholastic philosophy. After stating its general characteristics the writer gives its history from the earliest beginnings. Content and method are traced to Patristic writings and Greek philosophy; these were further developed by the works of Scotus Eriugena, whose *De divisione naturae* set up an original idealistic system. St. Anselm's "Fides quaerens intellectum," an ingenious synthesis of theological speculation, mystical contemplation, and practical activity, inaugurated Scholasticism as such. Further progress was evidenced in the early decades of the thirteenth century due to the study of the Aristotelian, Arabian, and Neo-Platonic systems, the rise of the universities of Paris and Oxford, and the scientific achievements of the Dominicans and Franciscans. This high period of Scholasticism is characterized in the first place by a strong Augustinian trend. Alexander of Hales, the first great representative of the period, is also the founder of the early Franciscan school which formed a St. Bonaventure and his school of the next generation. The strife of Augustinian and Peripatetic elements of the period was overcome by the harmonious efforts of St. Albertus Magnus, the founder of Christian Aristotelianism, and of St. Thomas Aquinas, whose *Summa Theologica* is a clarified, well rounded synthesis of Augustinian theology, of Greek Patristic writings, and of Aristotelian philosophy. To this same period belong the scientific method of Roger Bacon and the Neo-Platonism of some of the mystics. The article concludes with the movement in the nineteenth century toward Neo-Scholasticism.

Other articles in the field of philosophy are Spiritism; Stoicism, its history and principal representatives, its doctrine; Scepticism; Substance; Spinoza, Schelling, Spencer, Schopenhauer, and Shaftsbury. Under Soul, besides the usual topics of spirituality, substantiality, unity, and immortality, we find popular beliefs and representations of the soul, then psychopathics, directors, metempsychosis, and the "cura animarum".

In the domain of religion we find Sin, its nature, different kinds, effects, the evolution of a sin, sin and justification; Sacraments, the Catholic teaching and Protestant doctrine; under Baptism, apart from its nature and effects, its minister and recipient, its ceremonies, there is Baptism among the schismatic Orientals and Protestants, also local popular customs; Sunday, its observance during the centuries, religious and popular Sunday customs, various laws regarding the Sunday rest. The volume contains many articles dealing with Sacred Scriptures: Creation, the doctrine and its dogmatic development, its doctrine and philosophy, the Biblical account; Ecclesiasticus, Proverbs, Synagogue, Sanhedrin, and Temple. This last describes Solomon's temple and that of Herodius and the temple place of to-day. The Talmud originated in the necessity of a commentary for the Pentateuch. It consists of the Mishna, a collection of traditions and decisions of the Rabbi Jehuda, and the Babylonian Gemara, a commentary to the Mishna. Mention at least must be made of the following: Synoptics and the various attempts at a satisfactory solution of the Synoptic problem in the past and in the present; Schism, the Syllabus of Pius IX (1864) and of Pius X (1907).

Other important topics are State, Secularization, Socialism, Schools, Punishment, Slavery; Russia, Rumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, with their respective history of the Church; St. Stephen, invoked as protector of horses and the patron of coachmen and masons; the Popes Sixtus, I to V, Silvester, I to IV (the anti-pope), Stephen, I to IX; Tauler, Söderblom and the Stockholm Conference, Solojew, " Simon " fills eleven-and-a-half columns.

The present volume of the *Lexikon* is on the same high plane of scholarship as the preceding ones and we look forward to the next and last volume of the collection.

SAINT BENEDICT. By Dom Justin McCann. Sheed & Ward, New York. 1937.

This is a brief but comprehensive history of the Great Father of the Monks. The author, before introducing Saint Benedict, begins his narrative with the Fall of the Western Empire. This is an important preliminary, for it is necessary to understand the calamitous period in which the Saint flourished in order to appreciate his remarkable character and astounding achievement. Rome, the mistress of the world, was dying. The internal decay and the external assaults and frequent incursions of the barbarians were eating away the foundations of this once glorious but human structure. Invasion had flattened her fertile plains; tyranny and oppressive taxation had crushed the spirit of the citizen; the progress of civilization was arrested, and the arts of civilized life were in partial eclipse. Strangers, like the Franks, the Visigoths and the Vandals, were streaming across her frontiers and a powerful Arianism was hacking away at the gates of Catholicism. Into a topsy-turvy world like this came Saint Benedict.

The author was confronted with a difficult task in describing the early years of the Saint, for posterity has been left scarcely anything concerning his genealogy, associates or education. He is able, however, to adduce enough facts from the " Dialogues " and the Rule to illustrate that the famous brother of Saint Scholastica is the " Vir Dei " that Saint Gregory the Great, his earliest biographer, calls him.

Saint Benedict attempted to hide from a confused world and be alone with God, but men in their exigency sought him in his solitude. Yielding at length to their prayers, the hermit became the cenobite. He raised the active life to a higher sphere by uniting it with the contemplative. He dignified agricultural toil, which was considered fit only for slaves, and in this made a great contribution to human progress. For the glory of God and the sanctification of souls he accepted the evangelical counsels and made practical application of them.

The author points out that the " Regula " or scheme of government is the crowning achievement of Saint Benedict. This precious document, preserved by the harrassed monks of Monte Cassino, reveals the keen mind and the ideals of the holy founder. It is a " monument of legislative art, remarkable alike for its completeness, its simplicity, and its adaptability." It serves to show that the Benedictine is not a contemplative order, if the word is taken in its modern technical sense as excluding active work. Although the material structure of the Saint passed away, the Rule continues to exert its influence.

Father McCann's treatment is not a mere pen picture, but also a well documented and critical study of Benedictinism. It should appeal to all scholars for its conciseness and accuracy. All who read the book will come to the realization of the great debt that the Church and civilization owe to Saint Benedict and his disciples.

THINK AND LIVE. By Bakewell Morrison, S.J., S.T.D. and Stephen J. Rueve, S.J., Ph.D. Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. Pp. 183.

Presented as a course in natural religion for the non-Catholic student in the Catholic college, the content of this handy volume may perhaps be best described as the happy achievement of the authors' purpose. " The subject matter is comprehensive, the whole range of human activity being laid under tribute. But the plan is simple, the emphasis unmistakable, and the progress is made in a single direction." The thesis that a merely but truly rational approach to life leads to effectively ethical living is not new. The novel characteristic of this treatment is that the principles involved are so aptly applied to current problems; the tools of thought are made to fashion a perspective of the complexity in which we live. The chapter on Communism is more enlightening in its summary of that issue than all the factual descriptions and denouncements available.

The combination of logic, psychology, metaphysics and ethics as coordinate contributions to the picture is a masterly philosophical mosaic. The thought is cut to the theme, but suffers no loss of its truth. Comprehension and clarity are constant companions, and the book is as easy to read as it must have been difficult to write. There is meat for the student, and sauce for the scholar. The lasting lesson for both is that man is a reasoning animal, and nothing should be mentally absorbed that is not digestible through the agency of thought well-founded.

The book cannot fail to profit those for whom it is intended, nor should it fail to please the much wider circle of those who already know, but who ever need to review the principles which effect an intelligent evaluation of environment. For the truth that is considered trite has lost the practical force of its truthfulness.

PAULUS. By Dr. Josef Holzner. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co. Pp. x+458.

DIE HEILIGE SCHRIFT FUR DAS LEBEN ERKLART. Band XV, Die Kleinen Paulusbriefs. By Dr. Peter Ketter and Dr. Heinrich Molitor. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co. Pp. xii+411.

In his hero's life in the service of Christ, Dr. Holzner seeks to bring to the widest possible circle the life, activities and importance of the Apostle of the Gentiles. A born story-teller, the author holds his readers from first to last. He allows the figure of his hero to stand out so that his fruitful work and his tireless, self-sacrificing activity are fully appreciated. Following the trend of present-day biography he looks into the soul of the Apostle, shows his motives and makes them understood by the man of to-day. St. Paul is shown in his own environment and as a man of his own times. As Dr. Holzner answers the question, What does St. Paul mean to our times?, a fine piece of cultural and religious world history unfolds itself before the reader.

Particularly rich are the passages where the author treats of the mystical body of Christ. The term is used by St. Paul in no metaphorical sense. For him the mystical unity is as real as the natural unity of the human race. This idea of unity, Dr. Holzner points out, was much more appreciated in the early ages of Christianity and during the Middle Ages than it is at the present time. Nominalism and Positivism have weakened the bond of unity of mankind. In St. Paul this bond is love.

The book will be found fruitful for one's personal religious life as well as for an understanding of Christianity. Sixteen splendid illustrations, a map, a chronological table and a short bibliography add to the value of the book. The lack of an index is an inexplicable fault in this splendid volume.

Quite as interesting and important is Volume XV of *Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt.* Indeed, it is one of the richest in content and will render real aid to pastors who are trying to feed their flock on the words of the New Testament.

In the first part of the book Dr. Ketter treats the shorter epistles. With particularly fine enthusiasm does he present the loving letter of St. Paul to the Philippians, written from prison to the first Christian congregation in Europe. The full social content of the letter to Philemon is brought out, as is the glory of Christ and the Church in the other epistles.

Dr. Molitor of Mainz, in the second part, has all the fine qualities of Dr. Ketter. His study considers the letters to the Galatians, the Thessalonians, and the pastorals to Timothy and Titus. Particularly good is his presentation of the extremely important letter to the Galatians, where he develops the relationship between Judaism and the heathen world. One senses how this letter must have broken like a thunder-storm into the ranks of the hostile Judaizing clique. The letters to the Apostle's friend and disciple Timothy and his fellow laborer Titus, will be appreciated by priests on the mission. In them the father warns and begs his children, encourages them to apostolic life and work more grippingly and more fervently than in any of his other letters. Dr. Molitor, by the warmth and feeling of his treatment of these letters, will open them anew to modern pastors of souls.

SORROW BUILT A BRIDGE. A Daughter of Hawthorne. By Katherine Burton. Longmans, Green & Co., New York City. Pp. 288.

The life of Nathaniel Hawthorne's youngest child, Rose, was far from ordinary. It was the thoroughly interesting life of a pioneer, and the record of it is one of contrasts, of sacrifice, courage and determination.

The early years of Rose Hawthorne's life were scarcely adapted to prepare her for the work she undertook in later years. They were spent in an environment in which a pleasant domestic life was enhanced by associations suited to the development and appreciation of the more refined things of life. Thus attuned, her feelings revolted at the sight of any sordidness.

Her tranquil existence was first disturbed at an early age by the death of her father. This was probably the greatest sorrow of her life, although others of a similar nature were to be cast upon her before her life was far advanced. At the age of twenty she entered into a none-too-happy marriage with George Lathrop, together with whom she was converted to the Catholic faith in 1891. Her attempts to make a success of her marriage were in vain, and she and her husband separated.

Then began the crowning work of her life. Repressing as best she could her natural distaste for it, she cast herself with courageous resolution into the work of relieving the most neglected of those suffering from the dreaded affliction of cancer. There was no haven to which the cancerous poor might go to receive the attention they so sorely needed. In the face of opposition and ridicule, Rose Hawthorne Lathrop labored untiringly amid the din and squalor of New York's lower East Side slums to relieve this sorry condition—alone, at first; later, assisted by others attracted by the charitable work on which she was spending her energies. They became Dominican Tertiaries. As their superioress, Rose Hawthorne, Sister M. Alphonsa in religion, directed these Servants of Relief for Incurable Cancer. For thirty years her institution was her life. She did not set aside her talents but employed them to further her work. She founded homes the only card of admission to which was " poverty and hopeless illness ". These stand to-day as monuments to one who would not accept defeat.

Sorrow Built a Bridge is the narrative, interestingly related, of the life of this really great character. In a few places the story could be better rounded out. This would avoid the apparent effect of too sudden a transition from one fact to another. This defect, however, is rare enough not to detract from the book as a whole. It is a record well worth the time one spends in reading it.

SPANISH REHEARSAL. By Arnold Lunn. New York: Sheed and Ward. 1937. Pp. xiv+254.

CORRESPONDENT IN SPAIN. By Edward H. Knoblaugh. New York: Sheed and Ward. 1937.

SPAIN AND THE CHRISTIAN FRONT. By Arnold Lunn. New York: Sheed and Ward. 1937. Pp. xii+233.

AND THEN THE STORM. By Sister Monica, Ph.D. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1937. Pp. xiv+231.

It seems very difficult for American newspaper readers to get any news of the Spanish civil war that is not at least tinged with evident anti-Nationalist bias. The impression is conveyed that the Leftists (always " Loyalists ") are defending their native land against the attacks of a fascist cabal, which is aided and abetted by the Italian and German totalitarian states. Against these outlanders are fighting the united Spanish people. That Russia was a potent participant was at first completely ignored, and even to-day little reference is made to the men and munitions which Stalin is pouring into Spain.

Many books on the Spanish conflict have appeared in recent months, but most of them seem to be communistic propaganda, or to have the bias mentioned above. Only in a few cases do the accounts present objective evidence. In the above pamphlet, Dr. Lunn says, "Every Catholic teacher in universities and schools who takes the trouble to master the main facts about this war and to talk formally or informally to his pupils can help to armor our Catholics against the anti-Catholic propaganda which masks itself so cleverly as propaganda in favor of democracy." Priests, too, should take the trouble to master the main facts, and *Spanish Rehearsal* and *Correspondent in Spain* can be recommended to supply a goodly number.

Mr. Lunn's pamphlet is an appeal that American Catholics should not dismiss the struggle in Spain with a contemptuous, "Six of one and half a dozen of the other". This is an attitude, he points out, that Leftist propaganda is trying hard to establish. His *Spanish Rehearsal* gives a more detailed treatment of the subject.

The first part of *Spanish Rehearsal* is concerned with Mr. Lunn's personal impressions of a journey through war-time Spain from Irun to Algeciras. The author is patently favorable to the Nationalist side, but, as he says, the ratio of facts to moral indignation is particularly high. In the second part, a background is presented which makes it easier to understand the present conflict: Communist tactics, the preparation made in Spain by Communists, which dates back to the Marxist Manifesto issued by the Madrid Section in 1869, their propaganda and irresponsibility. The chapter on "The Spanish Church" is excellently done. Mr. Lunn points out that the spoliation of the Church has never been a popular movement in Spain, as the people discovered early in the last century that it was the poor who suffered when the Church was despoiled, and the rich Liberals who benefited. The book is well written, well documented, dramatic, instructive and enlightening. It can be recommended to every priest for personal reading and for lending.

Concerning *Correspondent in Spain*, Mr. Lunn says, "I have seen no more vivid or convincing study of Red Spain during the war." Mr. Knoblaugh was an Associated Press correspondent in Madrid until he was tipped off by a friend in the State Department that "an accident" was "looking for" him.

His story, told in anecdotal style, is based on personal observation and testimony of eye-witnesses, and he has made an evident effort to remain objective. Particularly well written is the chapter on the Loyalist propaganda machine which is so remarkably effective. "Within a short time the press of the world had forgotten the Loyalist excesses. What had at first been freely termed a 'Red government' became through the influence of skilful propaganda, a 'Democratic government' fighting to maintain 'democracy' against 'hordes of invaders'. The foreign assistance which Loyalist Spain was receiving was successfully minimized, while that given the enemy assumed staggering proportions." This is something that Mr. Knoblaugh knows well, and this chapter must make certain American publishers squirm with embarrassment, as they realize how easily they were hoaxed. This book supplies first-hand information, and those who wish to keep informed on the Spanish war cannot afford to ignore it.

One day in 1937 a firing squad stood before the statue of the Sacred Heart in the square of Madrid and blew it to pieces. This image of the Saviour once marked the geographical center of Spain and symbolized that the King of Kings was the very soul of the nation. Catholics, the world over, stunned by the wanton destruction of lives and the unspeakable desecration of holy places, have wondered how all this can happen in the land of Teresa of Avila, Ignatius Loyola and Isabella the Catholic. And what will be the outcome? After the storm has spent its fury, will the Spaniard stand with clenched fist and shout the Internationale or kneel and chant the Te Deum?

Sister Monica, an Ursuline nun, a reliable eyewitness of the Spanish tragedy, predicts in her book, whose title is given above, the rise of a new and better Spain. She considers the situation chiefly from a sociological standpoint and sees the real need of a practical application of the principles of social justice as enunciated by the Holy Fathers. She reveals also the soul of the Spaniard. He is still a child of Mother Church. And although the Moslem rule of seven centuries has influenced his temperament, it has not stifled him spiritually. "Most of the leisured class and many of the working class hear Mass every morning out of devotion," she writes. Impressive and enlightening is her vivid description of the celebration of the national feast of the Immaculate Conception, and likewise the hopeful rise and spread of the Catholic Action movement, which is not political but social and aimed to awaken a right conscience. This alone can dictate social justice.

For those who wish a better understanding of contemporary Spain, the reader will find *And Then the Storm* a book that is informative, interesting and convincing.

Book Notes

Of the making of many text books in Religion there is no end, but new needs call for new books. To provide for the religious instruction of the Catholic students in our public high schools the Rev. Ferdinand C. Falque, S.T.B., has brought out volume one of *Catholic Truth in Survey* (Benziger, New York, 1937, pp. xvii + 237). This volume deals with " God our Creator ". All the matter is arranged in the form of units. There are no questions and answers, but every chapter has appended to it what is called " Mastery of the Topic " containing stimulating review questions. Other helpful features are the glossary, the index, and the illustrations.

" The Emancipation Proclamation freed the slaves." Remember that parrot-like chant of grade school days! To-day, we need another emancipation proclamation to free the negro from the slavery of racial prejudice and injustice. Thinking Catholics are doing much to counteract unchristian attitudes toward the negro. The Catholic Worker group, the Campions, the Blessed Martìn Guild and many individual priests and laymen are working hard to overcome racial prejudice and to assure the negro that he really is a member of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Blessed Martìn de Porres (Kenedy, New York, N. Y.; 1937; pp. xii + 212) is a worthy official publication sponsored by the Blessed Martìn Guild. Father Kearns, O.P., its author, does well in beginning the life of this saintly lay brother with a study of " The Land of the Incas ". A glance at the social and economic conditions caused by the Spanish conquest of Peru helps one to appreciate the efforts of Blessed Martìn to ameliorate the situation. Not that it was his actual intention to be a social worker, for it was the charity of Christ that moved him to do all in his power to relieve human misery. In practice, however, Brother Martìn was a social worker. His program was the program of Christ and of many a Saint noted for charity—the spiritual and corporal works of mercy.

This life of the " Flying Brother ", as Blessed Martìn was called because of his power of bilocation, is the " most authentic and detailed book on Blessed Martìn in the English language ". The knowledge and love of Blessed Martìn ought to have a beneficial effect on the negro in our country and dispel the racial prejudice of too many Catholics.

In *Dorfseelsorge* (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Missouri; 1937; pp. xii + 222.) Von Carl Maier gives us an insight into the moral and religious sense of the simple farmfolk of Germany. After years of experience and contact with these people he writes with authority and understanding. He maintains that while the countryfolk have a very high esteem for the priesthood, nothing causes more havoc in a village parish than a haughty and unsympathetic pastor. According to the author, these people need careful guidance, and will be helped particularly by an appreciation of the liturgy.

In *Dorfseelsorge* we read how the rural church suffered during and immediately after the World War, how the farmers flocked to the cities to seek fortunes which they never found, and how they finally drifted into the ranks of Communism.

Fully realizing the needs of these people, the author tells us about the qualifications that are necessary for a successful village pastor. The book serves as a complement to pastoral theology, and is to be recommended particularly to theological students and young priests who expect to serve Christ in rural parishes.

In the present conflict between modern unbelief and Christianity, when God, Divine Revelation and the Bible itself are under fire, it is encouraging to pick up a book that goes to the heart of the problems and seeks to shed light on these perplexing questions. Such a book is that of Thomas H. Moore, S.J., *I Also Send You* (Fordham University Press, New York, 1937, pp. ix + 180). In nineteen chapters the author covers a wide field of theological topics: the existence of a personal God—His communications to men, the authenticity and authorship of the Gospels and their historical value in representing to us the words and actions of Christ. The Divinity of Christ is proved by selected passages from the Gospels. Christ established the Church in order to lead men to salvation; hence the author quite logically treats of the Birth of the Church and the characteristics by means of which we may find the true Church of Christ to-day.

The Protestant and Oriental Churches also receive some consideration. Papal Infallibility and some of the famous cases of "Papal fallibility" come up for examination. Finally, this delightful book is brought to a close with a chapter on the Encyclicals and on the Mystical Body of Christ.

The author, after having established the authenticity and historical value of the Gospels, drives home his arguments with a wealth of Scripture texts and Gospel incidents and establishes in a scientific way the position of the Catholic Church in the world. The whole treatment of these topics is not cut and dried, for the trappings and technicalities are cast aside. Besides all this, a detailed index adds to the practical character of the book. Written in a pleasing and convincing style, this handy volume should appeal to students, seminarians and priests and find a welcome reception at their hands.

With charming and persuasive simplicity Abbé Paul Marc presents the meditations of his *Pages d'Evangile*. There is really nothing new in matter or in presentation. Short sentences, almost ejaculations, giving time for the reader to think, is the style employed; some of the more dramatic events of our Lord's public ministry and after His Resurrection are the subjects of the meditations. The simplicity however is so appealing that the little book is likely to prove popular. An appendix, "L'Art de 'converser avec Dieu' en méditant" is well done and a really worth-while addition to the book. (Paris, P. Lethielleux; pp. 197; 1937.)

Dr. Conrad Gröber's translation of the life of St. Charles Borromeo by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Cesare Orsenigo will be welcomed by German readers. The study is concerned with the great Archbishop of Milan as a reformer of his diocese, and treats only superficially many of the familiar episodes in the life of St. Charles. The book is translated from the third Italian edition, and is well done. The binding and presswork are up to the usual high standards which the Herder Company sets for itself. (*Der heilige Carl Borromäus*; pp. xx-+416, St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co.)

Most liturgists will want for handy reference, Dr. C. Callewaert's *De Missalis Romani Liturgia*, Sectio Prior, De Rebus Cultus Materialibus. (Bruges, Belgium. Charles Beyaert; pp. 96). It presents in a small compass all that need be known about the church building, the altar and its ornaments, the sacred vessels and vestments, the liturgical colors, and the consecration, blessing and care of the above.

In his little *Ground Plan for Catholic Reading*, F. J. Sheed presents a "map of Catholic reading" for the man who wants to study Catholicism but who does not know where to begin, and for the man who wishes to read logically. (New York, Sheed & Ward; pp. 34.)

It is a serviceable brochure, so useful that priests will find almost daily need of it in their convert work. The introductory chapter, "Reading and Education," is excellently done, while the "Ground Plan" itself contains paragraphs that are not likely to be forgotten. His "two pieces of general advice" are well worth repeating. "(1) Do not be put off from getting a writer's real message by dislike of his personality, a preliminary feeling of his dullness or any such reaction. . . . (2) Do not swallow any writer whole: not even a Catholic writer. Don't swallow him, listen to him. If he be a really great writer he can see far more than you can: borrow his eyes: but do not surrender your own mind."

Little Catherine of the Miraculous Medal, by a Sister of Charity at St. Joseph's College, is written for children. This does not mean that the book is a dreary recital of facts couched in common words and short sentences. Although the vocabulary is carefully chosen, the interesting and lively style is what the children who read the book will appreciate and it will make them really know Blessed Catherine Labouré. The large number of illustrations will please the small readers. (New York, Benziger Brothers; pp. ix + 176.)

Sister Mary Immaculata of Maryknoll has cast in novel form the life story of Catherine Tekakwitha, the cause of whose beatification is now before the Holy See. *Our Kateri,* who " walked in heaven " while she trod the forest trails, has a special appeal for Americans, and particularly for youthful Americans. Concisely written and with a fine appreciation of spiritual values, *Our Kateri* will give many a youngster—and oldster too—an idea of the consolation that is sometimes given the missionary who leaves home and friends to labor for those who lack the all important gift. (New York, Benziger Brothers; pp. xv + 129.)

Those interested in catechetics are given an opportunity to read the papers and discussions of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference by the publication of *Religious Instruction* (Washington, D. C. Capuchin College; pp. lvi +216, price $1.00.) Reports of the six sessions are given as well as the thirteen formal papers that were presented.

His Excellency Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara presented a paper on Leadership in Religious Instruction which will prove interesting to every priest. This was followed by papers on Training our Clerics for Religious Instruction and Religious Instruction—Method and Text. A symposium on Religious Instruction considered elementary and secondary schools, colleges and students in non-Catholic schools, and vagrants. Three papers on the Correlation of Religious Instruction—Sacred Scripture, Church History and Liturgy, present matter that can be used to advantage by priests and teachers. Religious Instruction for Adults, The Third Order of St. Francis and Religious Instruction, and The Religion Teacher's Library, compiled by Fathers Kirsch and Vogel, complete the papers and discussions.

While the Report is of interest principally to Franciscans, and was published for them primarily, all priests and religious teachers will find in it much of profit and instruction.

The reception that was accorded to the *Life of Sister Mary John Berchmans* has prompted a second edition of the work. The authoress, Sister Mary Edwin O'Neil, has based the volume on the spiritual gems of piety met with in the saintly nun's diary. Sister Berchmans was an eminent educator, directing her pupils toward the greater glory of God and the ennoblement of life. " Work and pray " sums up the theme of her useful career. The book should prove an inspiration for our religious women. (Benziger Brothers, New York; pp. 234.)

During hours of devotion before the Blessed Sacrament are we as near to our Lord as we should be? In those precious moments Jesus is so close, yet so many, in spite of His repeated pleas to draw near, remain far away. This is true of many of us. If it is true of you, Father Reany's book *Eucharistic Hours for Priests and People* may furnish the guidance needed to make the time spent in adoration of untold spiritual profit. Father Reany leads the reader to the very feet of our Lord. There follows a period in which the author is forgotten entirely. The whole action then is between Jesus and the reader,—the latter not as a reader, but as an adorer, an adorer who should again and again select Father Reany to be his spiritual guide for this hour.

Undoubtedly the matter contained in this volume will be found somewhat deep except for those versed in spiritual terminology and expression. To these, however, this book presents an opportunity for many a fruitful visit in the peace of the Eucharistic Presence. (P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York; pp. 286.)

Since the world has imperceptibly lapsed into a state of delirium as a result of growing social and economic complications, the restoration to mankind of some semblance of sanity has become the demand of the hour. As a means to this end there has arisen the more immediate need of developing a spirit of prayer in all men. To meet this need is the object of Fr. Thaddeus Soiron's latest book, *Das Geheimnis des Gebetes* (B. Herder & Co., St. Louis, Mo.; pp. vi + 199.)

The author successfully shows that the solution of the mystery of modern troubles depends upon the elucidation of the mystery of prayer. All practical forms of prayer have been intentionally omitted from this treatise in favor of a more or less theological consideration of the source and the efficacy of prayer. Prayer itself is a gift and a grace of God, for He has given man the wherewithal to pray, and has established prayer as an essential desire and a natural function of every human heart. Thus it is that man has at his disposal an adequate means of coming to a true knowledge of self, of acquiring a lovable intimacy with God, and of gaining a vivid realization of the vast extent of his own latent possibilities as a child of God. Being the vernacular of heaven, prayer has the power of bringing man into communication with the Triune God, the Mother of God, the angels and the saints; at the same time it elevates man above earthly affairs to give him that clear perspective peculiar to saints and much desired by the present confused generation. It is with comparative simplicity of expression and yet with rare subtlety of analysis that the author succeeds in conveying to the reader this message, Prayer solves the mystery of man's life, for man is most a man when he prays.

The study of "grace" will ever engage the minds of theologians. A doctoral dissertation on the subject is published at the Seminary of Saint Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, Illinois. *Doctrina Sancti Bonaventurae De Deiformitate* (pp. ii + 106, 1936) is the title and John J. Hartinet is the author of this piece of research. In six chapters he gives us an idea of our sharing in the Divine Nature by sanctifying grace and the image of God in our souls as he found these matters expressed in the writings of the Seraphic Doctor. It is gratifying to see a fresh treatment of a doctrine that has undergone little or no theological development for the last two hundred years. An index of the principal subjects treated serves as a helpful guide.

Following largely the distinguished scholar of Roman jurisprudence, Albertario, and supplanting the older and uncritical works of Voigt, Heumann-Seckel, Bozzoni, etc., Carlo Alberto Maschi has produced a profound piece of research at Milan's Catholic University of the Sacred Heart: *La Concezione Naturalistica del Diritto e degli Instituti Giuridici Romani* (Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero"; pp. viii + 395, 1937). This learned work is one of the best scientific treatments of the natural law in Roman sources that we have seen. It has a valuable analytical index and an imposing list of the publications of the University of the Sacred Heart.

From the same University and publishing house comes *La Giurisdizione Ecclesiastica nel Diritto Italiano* (p. xix + 380; 1937), by Orio Giacchi. It is a very practical study for both the Italian jurist and the canonist in Italy. The first part treats of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the pre-concordat Italian law, with special reference to the Law of Guarantees. The second and by far the larger part deals exclusively with matrimonial legislation. The third part covers a wide variety of topics bearing upon civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The interesting question of the Church's powers in the State laws of Italy has some definite answers in this volume. One misses, however, an alphabetical index.

For forty years the Rev. Charles R. Baschab, Ph.D., has been teaching religion and for almost two decades he has been teaching teachers of religion. Hence he certainly has had the experience to fit him to write a text book on Religion. His *Manual of the Catholic Religion* (San Francisco, Text Book Publishing Company, 1937, pp. 223) is Part One of a series of text books for college students. The *Manual* might also serve as a source-book for high school teachers of religion. The educated laity might also turn to the book for stimulating reading and our priests will find the volume useful in preparing catechetical instructions.

The book is arranged in form of question and answer followed by detailed exposition. It is to be regretted that the author does not provide questions and topics for discussion as well as references for further reading. In short, the book would seem to lack due appeal for self-activity on the part of the students.

Books Received

BIBLICAL.

Pages d'Évangile: Méditations. Par Abbé P. Marc. Second edition. P. Lethielleux, Paris, France. 1937. Pp. viii + 195. Prix, 12 francs.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

Christ's Little Ones. Life Stories of Model Children. By the Reverend Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S. The Society of the Divine Savior, St. Nazianz, Wisconsin. 1937. Pp. x + 231.

Institutiones Theologicae Dogmaticae. Tractatus de Sacramentis, Pars 1: De Sacramentis in genere. De Baptismo, de Confirmatione, de Eucharistia. Auctore, Iosepho Mors, S.J. Editora "Vozes" Petropolis, Petropolis, Brazil. 1937. Pp. 339. Preço da obra em brochura, 15$000; encadernada, 18$000.

Why are You Fearful? Adapted from the German of Father Athanase, O.F.M., by Marion A. Habig, O.F.M., A.M. The St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J. 1937. Pp. 93.

I Give Glory. A Book for the Sick. By the Abbe Henri Perreyve. Translated by M. G. Chadwick. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Pp. 95. Price, $1.25.

Letters of Teresa Higginson. Selected and discussed by a Monk of St. Augustine Abbey, Ramsgate. B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Pp. 79. Price, $0.90.

Instructions on Christian Doctrine. The Apostles' Creed. Adapted from the Italian of the Very Reverend Ildephonsus Bressanvido, O.F.M., and other sources by the Reverend Nicholas O'Rafferty. The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1937. Pp. xiv + 328. Price, $2.75.

Notre Dame de Bonheur. Par Edmond Joly. Préface de Son Eminence le Cardinal Baudrillart, de l'Académie Française, Recteur de l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Éditions Casterman, Paris, France. 1937. Pp. 203. Prix, 15 fr.

Die Herrlichkeit des christlichen Sterbens. Von Eugen Walter. B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Pp. 88. Price, $0.65.

Jenseitige Menschen. Eine Sinndeutung des Ordensstandes. Von Dominikus Thalhammer, S.J. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Pp. viii + 97. Price, $0.80.

Eucharistic Whisperings. Devout Reflections and Considerations on the Holy Eucharist and Heart to Heart Talks with Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. Adapted by the Reverend Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S., from the German translation by Ottilie Boediker. Vol. VII. The Society of the Divine Savior, St. Nazianz, Wisconsin. 1937. Pp. 133. Price, $0.75.

Spotlights on Matters Spiritual. By the Reverend Winfred Herbst, S.D.S. Frederick Pustet Co., Inc., New York City. 1937. Pp. xi +280. Price, $2.25*net*.

Holy Mass, The New Passover. By Most Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D. Pp. 64. 1937. Published by the Author at Antigonish, N. S.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

An Introduction to Logic. By Jacques Maritain. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1937. Pp. xii + 300. Price, $2.50.

God, Man and the Universe. An Answer to the Godless. Edited by the Reverend Ivan Kologriwof, S.J. English Translation edited by the Reverend Aloysius Ambruzzi, S.J. George E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., London, England. 1937. Pp. xxiv + 594. Price, 6 shillings.

HOW TO GIVE SEX INSTRUCTIONS. A Guide for Parents, Teachers and Others Responsible for the Training of Young People. By the Reverend P. J. Bruckner, S.J. With a Foreword by the Reverend Daniel A. Lord, S.J. The Queen's Work, St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Pp. 80. Price, 25c.

HISTORICAL.

THE LIFE OF FATHER FRANCIS JORDAN. Founder and first Superior General of the Society of the Divine Savior. By the Reverend P. Pancratius Pfeiffer, second Superior General of the same Society. Translated by the Reverend Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S. The Society of the Divine Savior, St. Nazianz, Wisconsin. 1936. Pp. 574.

SAINT BENEDICT. By Dom Justin McCann, Master of St. Benet's Hall, Oxford. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1937. Pp. 301. Price, $2.75.

BLESSED JOSEPH PIGNATELLI OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. By the Right Reverend Monsignor D. A. Hanley, P.A. Benziger Brothers, New York City. 1937. Pp. xii + 269. Price, $2.75.

THE SOCIETY OF THE SACRED HEART IN NORTH AMERICA. By Louise Callan, A.M., Ph.D. Introduction by the Reverend Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. Longmans, Green & Co., New York City. 1937. Pp. xvii + 809. Price, $5.00.

PHILIP II. By William Thomas Walsh. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1937. Pp. xvi + 770. Price, $5.00.

VIERZEHN NOTHELFER. Von Karl Hanns Erkelenz. B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Pp. 318. Price, $2.25.

HISTORY OF THE PARISH OF SAINT JOAN OF ARC. By the Right Reverend Edward Hawks. The Peter Reilly Company, Philadelphia, Pa. 1937. Pp. vii + 172. Price, $2.00.

HERCULES MULLIGAN. Confidential Correspondent of General Washington. By Michael J. O'Brien, LL.D. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City. 1937. Pp. 190. Price, $2.50.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S ASSOCIATIONS WITH THE IRISH. By Michael J. O'Brien, LL.D. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City. 1937. Pp. 271. Price, $2.50.

PIONEER IRISH IN NEW ENGLAND. By Michael J. O'Brien, LL.D. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City. 1937. Pp. 325. Price, $3.50.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE FRANCISCAN ALMANAC, 1938. Published with Ecclesiastical approbation by Saint Anthony's Guild, Paterson, N. J. 1938. Pp. xix + 623. Price, $0.75.

COMMUNISM: THE OPIUM OF THE PEOPLE. By the Right Reverend Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen. The Saint Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J. 1937. Pp. 40. Price, 10c.

PAMPHLETS:

Visits to the King of Kings. By the Reverend W. Raemers, C.SS.R. Pp. 64. *Saint Etheldreda.* By Elizabeth Wilcocks. Pp. 32. *Sacramentals.* By the Reverend Dominic Devas, O.F.M. Pp. 22. *The Chauffeuse-Secretary.* By Margaret Laycock. Pp. 30. *The Holy Rosary.* Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Pius XI on the Holy Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Pp. 12. (Price, 1 penny). *Our Catholic Marriage Service.* By the Reverend Herbert Thurston, S.J. Pp. 32. 1937. The Catholic Truth Society, 38/40 Eccleston Square, London, England. Price, twopence each. *Prayers are always Answered.* By the Reverend Daniel A. Lord, S.J. Pp. 35. *Thanks to the Communists.* By the Reverend Daniel A. Lord, S.J. Pp. 36. The Queen's Work, St. Louis, Missouri. 1937. Price, 10c. each.